arXiv:1211.2415v1 [math.AP] 11 Nov 2012

MARKOVIAN EXTENSIONS OF SYMMETRIC SECOND ORDER ELLIPTIC DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS

ANDREA POSILICANO

Abstract. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be bounded with a smooth boundary Γ and let S be the symmetric operator in $L^2(\Omega)$ given by the minimal realization of a second order elliptic differential operator. We give a complete classification of the Markovian self-adjoint extensions of S by providing an explicit one-to-one correspondence between such extensions and the class of Dirichlet forms in $L^2(\Gamma)$ which are additively decomposable by the bilinear form of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator plus a Markovian form. By such a result two further equivalent classifications are provided: the first one is expressed in terms of an additive decomposition of the bilinear forms associated to the extensions, the second one uses the additive decomposition of the resolvents provided by Kreĭn's formula. The Markovian part of the decomposition allows to characterize the operator domain of the corresponding extension in terms of Wentzell-type boundary conditions. Some properties of the extensions, and of the corresponding Dirichlet forms, semigroups and heat kernels, like locality, regularity, irreducibility, recurrence, transience, ultracontractivity and Gaussian bounds are also discussed.

1. Introduction

A negative self-adjoint operator A on the real Hilbert space $L^2(X)$ is said to be Markovian if the semi-group e^{tA}, $t \ge 0$, is positivity-preserving and is a contraction in $L^2(X) \cap L^\infty(X)$. In 1959, in the seminal paper [3], Beurling and Deny discovered the connection between the Markov property for symmetric semi-groups and the contractivity property for Dirichlet spaces. Later, in 1970, Fukushima (see [15]) found the connection between regular Dirichlet forms and symmetric Hunt Markov processes, thus opening the way to the deep interplay between Dirichlet spaces and probability theory, and providing the analogue, in a Hilbert $L^2(X)$ space setting, of the well known connection between Feller Markov processes and Feller (i.e. strongly continuous, positivity preserving and contracting) semi-groups in $C_b(X)$, the Banach space of bounded continuous functions on X (see e.g. [41], [16] and [17] for a thorough introduction to Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes). Beside the probabilistic side, the Markovian property helps the study of the deep connections between analytic properties of the semi-groups and their generators as logarithmic Sobolev inequalities, ultracontractivity and heat kernel estimates (see e.g. [9], [20], [47] and references therein). Therefore it is worthwhile to find conditions guaranteeing the Markovian nature of a given self-adjoint operator. In particular, when $X = \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain with a smooth boundary Γ, we are interested in characterizing Markovian self-adjoint extensions of the minimal realization of a given symmetric second order (by positive maximum principle, for Markov generators the order can not be higher) elliptic operator in terms of boundary conditions.

The connections between boundary conditions and Markov property have a long history. Here a brief abstract.

In 1957, in the paper [12], Feller classified all Markovian self-adjoint realizations of symmetric (generalized) second order differential operators in $L^2(a,b)$, $(a,b) \subset \mathbb{R}$, in terms of boundary conditions. Such conditions (see [12], Theorem 10.2) are explicitly expressed in terms of certain inequalities on the coefficients of the 2×2 real symmetric matrix B describing the boundary conditions at $\{a\} \cup \{b\}$. It is easy to check (see Section 3 below) that such inequalities coincide, in such simple 2-dimensional Dirichlet spaces setting, with the necessary and sufficient conditions guaranteeing that the bilinear form associated with B is a Dirichlet form on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Thus Feller's results can be re-phrased in terms of a correspondence between Markovian self-adjoint extensions of a symmetric second order differential operators on an interval and Dirichet forms on its boundary.

In 1959, in the paper [48], Wentzell, aiming at extending Feller's results to higher dimensions, sought the most general boundary conditions which restrict a given elliptic second order differential operator in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ to a generator of a Feller Markov process, and hence of a Feller semigroup, in $C_b(\Omega)$. Wentzell's results, in the realm of Feller semi-groups, have been extended and clarified in a lot of successive papers by many authors (see e.g. [44], [45], [5], [43] and references therein). Since Wentzell's framework is a Banach space one, his results can not be directly re-phrased in a Dirichlet space language, which requires an Hilbert space setting. However looking back at Feller's results, and noticing that the boundary operator entering in Wentzell's conditions (see [48], formula (3)) appears to have (in the $L^2(\Omega)$-symmetric case) an associated bilinear form resembling the ones furnished by the Beurling-Deny decomposition for regular Dirichlet forms, the suggestion is clear: there should be a correspondence between Markovian self-adjoint extensions of a symmetric second order differential operators in $L^2(\Omega)$ and Dirichet forms in $L^2(\Gamma)$. The self-adjoint operators associated with the Dirichlet forms on the boundary should then realize Wentzell-type boundary conditions.

In 1969, Fukushima (see the paper [14]), given the resolvent density $R^D_\lambda(x,y)$ corresponding to absorbing barrier Brownian motion on a bounded domain Ω (i.e. the resolvent kernel of the Dirichlet Laplacian on Ω), considered the family of all conservative symmetric Markovian resolvent densities on Ω of the kind

$$R_\lambda(x,y)=R^D_\lambda(x,y)+H_\lambda(x,y)\,, \tag{1.1}$$

where $H_\lambda(x,y)$ is a positive function of $\lambda>0$, λ-harmonic in x for each λ and y, such that for any compact $K\subset\Omega$, $\sup_{x\in K,y\in\Omega}H_\lambda(x,y)$ is finite. By Dirichlet spaces and potential theory analysis, Fukushima found a correspondence between such a family and a class of Dirichlet spaces on the Martin boundary of Ω. The generalized Laplacians corresponding to such family of resolvents turn out to be characterizable in terms of boundary conditions involving the notion of (generalized) normal derivative in Doob's sense (see formula 6.8 in [14]). Fukushima's results have been extended to more general elliptic operators by Kunita (see [26]) and successively, by Silverstein (see [41], [42]) and LeJan (see [27]), to general Markovian generators. In particular Silverstein found a characterization, again in terms of Dirichlet spaces on the boundary, of the Markovian resolvents $R_\lambda\ge R^0_\lambda$ dominating a given one R^0_λ. For recent developments of boundary theory of Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes, we refer to the book [8] by Chen and Fukushima.

Here our approach is different from the ones described above: we build on the theory of self-adjoint extensions as initiated by Kreĭn [K], Višik [46], Birman [4] and Grubb [21]. In particular Grubb characterized all self-adjoint extensions of a given symmetric elliptic differential operator on a domain Ω with a smooth boundary in terms of (non-local) boundary conditions. Thus Wentzell-type boundary conditions, and their generalization due to the Dirichlet space approach initiated by Fukushima, should be part of Grubb's results. In recent years there has been a renovated interest for the connection between theory of self-adjoint extensions and boundary conditions for partial differential operators due to its re-formulation in terms of Kreĭn's resolvent formula (see [37], [40], [6], [38], [23], [7], [31], [18] and references therein). Let us notice that (1.1) (taking into account the characterization of the harmonic part H_λ given by formulae (4.5)-(4.7) in [14]) has the same structure as Kreĭn's formula for the resolvent of a self-adjoint extensions of the minimal Laplacian. This indicates that Fukushima's results can be re-phrased in terms of such a resolvent formula (see Theorem 4.25 and Remark 4.26).

The content of this paper is the following. Section 2 is of preliminary nature. Here at first we recall the theory of self-adjoint extensions of a given symmetric operator S, following the simple approach presented in [37] (building on previous paper [34]), to which we refer for proofs and relations with other equivalent methods. Then we provide the bilinear forms associated with the self-adjoint extensions and recall the connection between Markovian generators and Dirichlet forms, thus reducing the problem of the search of Markovian extensions to the characterization of self-adjoint extensions having associated bilinear forms which are Dirichlet forms. The section is concluded recalling the correspondence between regular Dirichlet forms and Hunt Markov processes and the connections between path properties of such processes and analytical properties of the corresponding Dirichlet forms like conservativeness, transience, recurrence and irreducibility.

In Section 3, to enhance the reader's intuition, we consider the toy example given by $\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ on the real interval $(0,\ell)$, re-obtaining, by straightforward considerations about Dirichlet forms on $\mathbb{R}^2$, Feller's results (as given in [12], Theorem 10.2). This simple example is instructive since it permits to introduce, in a simpler finite dimensional setting, many of the results that will be then obtained in the successive section.

In Section 4 we extend the construction given in the previous one to the case $S = A_{\min}$, where $A_{\min}$ denotes the minimal realization of an elliptic second order differential operator on a bounded domain Ω with a smooth boundary Γ. By a result due to Fukushima and Watanabe (which we recall in Theorem 4.8) the maximum element (with respect to the semi-order induced by the associated bilinear forms) of the set $\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ of the Markovian self-adjoint extensions of the $A_{\min}$ is the Neumann realization A_N. As an immediate consequence of such a result any Markovian self-adjoint extension of $A_{\min}$ satisfies a logarithmic Sobolev inequality; hence its semigroup is ultracontractive and Gaussian heat kernel estimates hold (see Corollaries 4.10 and 4.11). By Fukushima-Watanabe theorem we are led to consider the set $\widetilde{\mathsf{Ext}}(A_{\min}) \supseteq \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ of self-adjoint extensions sandwiched between the Dirichlet realization A_D (the minimun element of $\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$) and the Neumann one A_N. In Theorem 4.15 we give a simple recipe to define, in terms of bilinear forms $f_{\Pi,B}$ on $L^2(\Gamma)$, bilinear forms corresponding to extensions belonging to $\widetilde{\mathsf{Ext}}(A_{\min})$. Such estensions belong to $\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ whenever the corresponding forms $f_{\Pi,B}$ are Dirichlet forms. By combining such a Theorem 4.15 with its converse (see Theorem 4.20) we finally obtain Theorem 4.22 which provides a one-to-one correspondence between $\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ and the class of Dirichlet forms of $L^2(\Gamma)$ which admit a decomposition in terms of the Dirichlet form corresponding to (minus) the Dirichlet-to-Neuman operator on Γ plus a Markovian form. Such a result is the analogue, in our framework, of the correspondence established by Fukushima in [14]. In the case one could prove that the Markovian component is always closable (we conjecture that this is the case) one should obtain an even simpler correspondence (see Remark 4.27). In any case by Theorem 4.15 this latter correspondence holds in one direction, thus providing simple sufficient conditions leading to Markovian extensions. Theorem 4.22 has a simpler, equivalent version (see Theorem 4.23) in terms of bilinear forms: *Let F be a closed bilinear form on $L^2(\Omega)$. Then $F = F_A$, $A \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$, if and only $\mathscr{D}(F) \subseteq H^1(\Omega)$ and there exists a Markovian form f_b on $L^2(\Gamma)$ such that $F(u,v) = F_N(u,v) + f_b(\gamma_0 u, \gamma_0 u)$.* Here F_N is the bilinear form associated to the Neumann realization A_N and γ_0 is the trace (evaluation) map at Γ. Moreover, by Kreĭn's formula, a version of Theorem 4.23 in terms of resolvents can also be given (see Theorem 4.25). This provides our version of Fukushima's (1.1) (see Remark 4.26).

In section 5 we looks for the boundary conditions associated to a Markovian extension. By Theorem 5.3 (also see Corollary 5.4) these are defined in terms of the Markovian form f_b appearing in the decomposition provided by Theorem 4.22. In the case such a Markovian component is a regular Dirichlet form (a criterion is provided in Lemma 4.18), then, by Beurling-Deny decomposition, these boundary conditions resemble the ones obtained in Wentzell's seminal paper [48] (see Remark 5.5). Some examples are provided.

Let us conclude with a remark about our regularity assumptions. The hypothesis on the smoothnes of the boundary of Ω can be relaxed to $C^{1,1}$ (i.e. to boundaries which locally are the graph of a differentiable function having Lipschitz second order derivatives): by using the results contained in [38] and [23] all the statements here presented holds in this more general setting, the proof being essentially the same. By using the results contained in [18] and [19], we expect that our results can be further generalized to hold on domains with a Lipschitz boundary. Finally let us notice that the Fukushima-Watanabe theorem has been recently extended by Robinson and Sikora (see [39], Theorem 1.1) to the case of an elliptic operator on an arbitrary open bounded set Ω; see Remark 4.13 for some immediate consequences of such a result, in particular the one regarding Gaussian heat kernel estimates on sets with the extension property.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Notations.

- $\mathscr{H}$, $\mathfrak{h}$ denote Hilbert spaces with scalar products $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$, $(\cdot,\cdot)$ and corresponding norms $\|\cdot\|$, $|\cdot|$;
- Given a linear operator L we denote by
$$\mathscr{D}(L)\,,\quad \mathscr{K}(L)\,,\quad \mathscr{R}(L)\,,\quad \mathscr{G}(L)\,,\quad \rho(L)$$
its domain, kernel, range, graph and resolvent set respectively;
- For any $z\in\rho(L)$ we pose $R^L_z:=(-L+z)^{-1}$;
- $L|\mathscr{V}$ denotes the restriction of L to the subspace $\mathscr{V}\subset\mathscr{D}(L)$ and we pose $L\mathscr{V}:=\mathscr{R}(L|\mathscr{V})$;
- $\mathsf{Ext}(S)$ denotes the (eventually empty) set of all self-adjoint extensions of the symmetric operator S and $\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(S)\subseteq\mathsf{Ext}(S)$ denotes the subset of Markovian self-adjoint extensions;
- Given an orthogonal projector $\Pi:\mathfrak{h}\to\mathfrak{h}$, we use the same symbol Π to denote both the injection $\Pi|\mathscr{R}(\Pi):\mathscr{R}(\Pi)\to\mathfrak{h}$ and the surjection $(\Pi|\mathscr{R}(\Pi))^*:\mathfrak{h}\to\mathscr{R}(\Pi)$;
- $\mathsf{E}(\mathfrak{h})$ denotes the set of couples (Π,Θ), where Π is an orthogonal projection in $\mathfrak{h}$ and Θ is a self-adjoint operator in the Hilbert space $\mathscr{R}(\Pi)$;
- Given $v\in\mathfrak{h}$, $|v|=1$, the orthogonal projector $v\otimes v$ is defined by $[v\otimes v](u):=(v,u)\,v$;
- Given a sesquilinear (bilinear in the real case) form F, we pose $F(\phi):=F(\phi,\phi)$ for the corresponding quadratic form;
- F_A denotes the symmetric sesquilinear (bilinear in the real case) form associated with the self-adjoint operator $-A$ in the Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$;
- $f_{\Pi,\Theta}$, $(\Pi,\Theta)\in\mathsf{E}(\mathfrak{h})$, denotes the symmetric sesquilinear (bilinear in the real case) form associated with the self-adjoint operator Θ in the Hilbert space $\mathscr{R}(\Pi)$ and $f_\Theta\equiv f_{1,\Theta}$;
- $\mathsf{B}(X,Y)$ denotes the set of linear bounded operator on X to Y and $\mathsf{B}(X)\equiv\mathsf{B}(X,X)$;
- 1_B denotes the characteristic function of the set B;
- $u\wedge v:=\min\{u,v\}$, $u\vee v:=\max\{u,v\}$, $u_\#:=(0\vee u)\wedge 1$.

2.2. Self-adjoint Extensions.

Let
$$S:\mathscr{D}(S)\subseteq\mathscr{H}\to\mathscr{H}$$

be a symmetric linear operator such that $-S \ge \lambda_0 > 0$, i.e.

$$\forall\, \phi \in \mathscr{D}(S)\,, \quad \langle -S\phi, \phi\rangle \ge \lambda_0 \|\phi\|^2\,.$$

By Friedrichs' theorem S has a self-adjoint extension

$$A_0 : \mathscr{D}(A_0) \subseteq \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{H}$$

such that $-A_0 \ge \lambda_0$. A_0 is the unique self-adjoint extension such that $\mathscr{D}(A_0) \subseteq \mathscr{D}(F_0)$, where $\mathscr{D}(F_0)$ denotes the domain of F_0, the closure of the positive sesquilinear form $F^\circ(\phi, \psi) := \langle -S\phi, \psi\rangle$.

From now on we suppose that S is not essentially self-adjoint. Thus, by von Neumann's theory of self-adjoint extensions, there exists an unitary operator $U_0 : \mathscr{K}(S^*) \to \mathscr{K}(S^*)$, such that

$$\mathscr{H}_0 = \mathscr{D}(S^{**}) \oplus \mathscr{G}(U_0)\,,$$

$$A_0(\phi + \psi + U_0\psi) = S\phi + i\psi - iU_0\psi\,,$$

where $\mathscr{H}_0$ denotes the Hilbert space given by $\mathscr{D}(A_0)$ equipped with the scalar product (giving rise to the graph norm)

$$\langle \phi, \psi\rangle_0 := \langle A_0\phi, A_0\psi\rangle + \langle \phi, \psi\rangle\,.$$

Therefore the closure of S, i.e. S^{**}, is the restriction of A_0 to the kernel of the orthogonal projection from $\mathscr{H}_0$ onto $\mathscr{K}(S^*)$. Thus, since this gives some advantages in practical applications, we will look for the self-adjoint extensions of S by considering the equivalent problem of the search of the self-adjoint extensions of the restriction of A_0 to the kernel $\mathscr{K}(\tau)$, which we suppose to be $\mathscr{H}$-dense, of a surjective bounded linear operator

$$\tau : \mathscr{H}_0 \to \mathfrak{h}\,.$$

Typically A_0 is an elliptic differential operator, τ is some trace (restriction) operator along a null subset N and $\mathfrak{h}$ is some Hilbert space of functions on N.

For notational convenience let us introduce, for any $z \in \rho(A_0)$, the following bounded linear operators:

$$R^0_z : \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{H}_0\,, \quad R^0_z := (-A_0 + z)^{-1}$$

and

$$G_z : \mathfrak{h} \to \mathscr{H}\,, \quad G_z := \left(\tau R^0_{\bar z}\right)^*\,.$$

By the results provided in [37] (building on previous results obtained in [34] and [35]) one has the following

Theorem 2.1. *(i) The set* $\mathsf{Ext}(S)$ *is parametrized by* $\mathsf{E}(\mathfrak{h})$.
(ii) Let $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ *be the self-adjoint extension corresponding to* $(\Pi, \Theta) \in \mathsf{E}(\mathfrak{h})$. *Then*

$$A_{(\Pi,\Theta)} : \mathscr{D}(A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}) \subseteq \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{H}\,, \quad A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}\phi := A_0\phi_0\,, \tag{2.1}$$

(2.2)
$$\mathscr{D}(A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}):=\{\phi=\phi_0+G_0\xi_\phi\,,\ \phi_0\in\mathscr{D}(A_0)\,,\,\xi_\phi\in\mathscr{D}(\Theta)\,,\,\Pi\tau\phi_0=\Theta\xi_\phi\}\,.$$

(iii) The resolvent $R^{(\Pi,\Theta)}_z:=(-A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}+z)^{-1}$ *of* $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ *is given, for any* $z\in\rho(A_0)\cap\rho(A_{(\Pi,\Theta)})$*, by the Kreĭn's type formula*

$$R^{(\Pi,\Theta)}_z=R^0_z+G_z\Pi(\Theta+z\Pi G^*_0G_z\Pi)^{-1}\Pi G^*_{\bar z}\,. \tag{2.3}$$

Remark 2.2. The operator G_z is injective (by surjectivity of τ) and by Lemma 2.1 in [35], given the surjectivity hypothesis $\mathscr{R}(\tau)=\mathfrak{h}$ the density one $\overline{\mathscr{K}(\tau)}=\mathscr{H}$ is equivalent to

$$\forall z\in\rho(A_0)\,,\quad \mathscr{R}(G_z)\cap\mathscr{D}(A_0)=\{0\}\,. \tag{2.4}$$

So the decomposition appearing in $\mathscr{D}(A_{(\Pi,\Theta)})$ is unique. Moreover by first resolvent identity one obtains

$$\forall\, w,z\in\rho(A_0)\,,\quad G_w-G_z=(z-w)\,R^0_wG_z\,. \tag{2.5}$$

So

$$\mathscr{R}(G_w-G_z)\subseteq\mathscr{D}(A_0)$$

and

$$z\,G^*_0G_z=z\,G^*_zG_0=z\,G^*_0(1-z\,R^0_z)G_0=\tau(G_0-G_z)\,. \tag{2.6}$$

Remark 2.3. Notice that the knowledge of the adjoint S^* is not required. However it can be readily calculated: by [36], Theorem 3.1, one has

$$S^*:\mathscr{D}(S^*)\subseteq\mathscr{H}\to\mathscr{H}\,,\qquad S^*\phi=A_0\phi_0\,,$$
$$\mathscr{D}(S^*)=\{\phi\in\mathscr{H}\ :\ \phi=\phi_0+G_0\xi_\phi,\ \phi_0\in\mathscr{D}(A_0),\ \xi_\phi\in\mathfrak{h}\}$$

and the Green-type formula

$$\langle\phi,S^*\psi\rangle-\langle S^*\phi,\psi\rangle=(\hat\tau\phi,\hat\rho\psi)-(\hat\rho\phi,\hat\tau\psi) \tag{2.7}$$

holds true. Here the operators $\hat\tau$ and $\hat\rho$ are defined by

$$\hat\tau:\mathscr{D}(S^*)\to\mathfrak{h}\,,\qquad \hat\tau\phi:=\tau\phi_0$$

and

$$\hat\rho:\mathscr{D}(S^*)\to\mathfrak{h}\,,\qquad \hat\rho\phi:=\xi_\phi\,.$$

Also notice that $G_z\xi$ solves the boundary value type problem

$$\begin{cases}S^*G_z\xi=zG_z\xi\,,\\ \hat\rho G_z\xi=\xi\,.\end{cases} \tag{2.8}$$

Hence, by Theorem 2.1,

$$A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}=S^*|\{\phi\in\mathscr{D}(S^*)\ :\ \hat\rho\phi\in\mathscr{D}(\Theta)\,,\ \Pi\hat\tau\phi=\Theta\hat\rho\phi\}\,. \tag{2.9}$$

By [35], Theorem 3.1, $(\mathfrak{h}, \hat{\tau}, \hat{\rho})$ is a boundary triple for S^*, with corresponding Weyl function

$$M_z = z\, G_0^* G_z \equiv z\, G_z^* G_0\,. \tag{2.10}$$

We refer to [11] and references therein for boundary triplets theory.

2.3. **Sesquilinear Forms.** Here we determine the symmetric sesquilinear form F_A of $A \in \mathsf{Ext}(S)$. From now on we assume the following additional hypothesis on S:

$$\mathscr{K}(S^*) \cap \mathscr{D}(F_0) = \{0\}\,, \tag{2.11}$$

where F_0 is the sesquilinear form associated with $-A_0$, i.e. is the sesquilinear form of the Friedrichs' extension of $-S$. By Remark 2.3 one has $\mathscr{K}(S^*) = \mathscr{R}(G_0)$, and so, by (2.4), (2.11) is equivalent, since $\mathscr{D}(A_0) \subseteq \mathscr{D}(F_0)$, to

$$\mathscr{R}(G_0) \cap \mathscr{D}(F_0) = \{0\}\,. \tag{2.12}$$

Notice that hypotheses (2.11), or better its equivalent (2.12), ensures that the decomposition appearing in $\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})$ below is unique and so $F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ is well-defined. In the case S is the minimal realization of a 2nd order elliptic differential operator on a bounded domain, (2.11) always holds true (see Remark 4.2 below).

Next theorem is our version of Theorem 1.2 in [22] (also see Theorem 1 in [30]). There the more general case of (not necessarily self-adjoint) coercive extensions was considered. Our simpler framework allows for a straightforward proof, which we provide for the reader's convenience.

Theorem 2.4. *Let*

$$F_0 : \mathscr{D}(F_0) \times \mathscr{D}(F_0) \subseteq \mathscr{H} \times \mathscr{H} \to \mathbb{R}$$

be the positive sesquilinear form corresponding to $-A_0$ *and suppose that* (2.12) *holds true. Let* $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)} \in \mathsf{Ext}(S)$ *and let*

$$f_{\Pi,\Theta} : \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta}) \times \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta}) \subseteq \mathscr{R}(\Pi) \times \mathscr{R}(\Pi) \to \mathbb{R}$$

be the sesquilinear form corresponding to $(\Pi, \Theta) \in \mathsf{E}(\mathfrak{h})$. *Then the sesquilinear form* $F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ *corresponding to* $-A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ *is given by*

$$F_{(\Pi,\Theta)} : \mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}) \times \mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}) \subseteq \mathscr{H} \times \mathscr{H} \to \mathbb{R}\,,$$

$$F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}(\phi, \psi) = F_0(\phi_0, \psi_0) + f_{\Pi,\Theta}(\xi_\phi, \xi_\psi)\,,$$

$$\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}) := \{\phi = \phi_0 + G_0 \xi_\phi\,,\ \phi_0 \in \mathscr{D}(F_0)\,,\ \xi_\phi \in \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta})\}\,.$$

Proof. Let

$$L:\mathscr{D}(L)\subseteq\mathscr{H}\to\mathscr{H}$$

be the linear operator associated with $F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$, i.e.

$\mathscr{D}(L):=$

$\{\phi\in\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}):\exists\varphi\in\mathscr{H}\text{ s.t. }\forall\psi\in\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})\,,\ F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}(\phi,\psi)=\langle\varphi,\psi\rangle\}\,,$

$$L\phi:=\varphi\,.$$

Since $\mathscr{D}(F_0)\subseteq\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})$, $\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})$ is dense and so L is well-defined.

By the definition of $\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})$ and by taking, in the definition of $\mathscr{D}(L)$, at first $\xi_\psi=0$ and then $\psi=G_0\xi$, one gets that $\phi=\phi_0+G_0\xi_\phi\in\mathscr{D}(L)$ if and only if there exists φ such that

$$\forall\psi_0\in\mathscr{D}(F_0)\,,\quad F_0(\phi_0,\psi_0)=\langle\varphi,\psi_0\rangle$$

and

$$\forall\xi\in\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta})\,,\quad f_{\Pi,\Theta}(\xi_\phi,\xi)=\langle\varphi,G_0\xi\rangle\,.$$

Thus $\phi_0\in\mathscr{D}(A_0)$, $L\phi=-A_0\phi_0$, and

$$\langle\varphi,G_0\xi\rangle=\langle-A_0\phi_0,G_0\xi\rangle=(\tau\phi_0,\xi)=(\Pi\tau\phi_0,\xi)\,.$$

Therefore

$$\forall\,\xi\in\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta})\,,\quad f_{\Pi,\Theta}(\xi_\phi,\xi)=(\Pi\tau\phi_0,\xi)\,,$$

i.e.

$$\xi_\phi\in D(\Theta)\,,\quad\Theta\xi_\phi=\Pi\tau\phi_0\,.$$

In conclusion $\mathscr{D}(L)=\mathscr{D}(A_{(\Pi,\Theta)})$ and

$$L\phi=-A_0\phi_0=-A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}\phi\,.$$

□

Remark 2.5. By (2.5) and (2.10), by $(F_0+\lambda)(R^0_\lambda\phi,\psi)=\langle\phi,\psi\rangle$, $\lambda\geq 0$, and by Theorem 2.4, one has, for all $\alpha\geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}+\alpha\right)(G_\alpha\xi_1,G_\alpha\xi_2)\\=&F_0(G_\alpha\xi_1-G_0\xi_1,G_\alpha\xi_2-G_0\xi_2)+f_{\Pi,\Theta}(\xi_1,\xi_2)+\alpha(G_\alpha\xi_1,G_\alpha\xi_2)\\=&-\alpha F_0(R^0_0G_\alpha\xi_1,G_\alpha\xi_2-G_0\xi_2)+f_{\Pi,\Theta}(\xi_1,\xi_2)+\alpha(G_\alpha\xi_1,G_\alpha\xi_2)\\=&M_\alpha(\xi_1,\xi_2)+f_{\Pi,\Theta}(\xi_1,\xi_2)\,.\end{aligned}$$

We make use of this relation in the proof of Theorem 4.20 below.

Remark 2.6. Suppose that $f_{\Pi,\Theta}$ is lower bounded, so that $F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ is lower bounded. Then is immediate to check that if $\mathscr{C}(f_{\Pi,\Theta})$ is a core of $f_{\Pi,\Theta}$ and $\mathscr{C}(F_0)$ is a core of F_0 then

$$\mathscr{C}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}):=\{\phi\in\mathscr{H}\ :\ \phi=\phi_0+G_0\xi_\phi\,,\ \phi_0\in\mathscr{C}(F_0)\,,\ \xi_\phi\in\mathscr{C}(f_{\Pi,\Theta})\}$$

is a core of $F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$.

2.4. **Maximum and minimum extensions.** Let us now define

$$\mathsf{Ext}_0(S) := \{A \in \mathsf{Ext}(S) \,:\, -A \ge 0\}\,,$$

By Theorem 2.4 one immediately gets the following well known result going back to Birman (see [4]):

$$\mathsf{Ext}_0(S) = \{A_{(\Pi,\Theta)} \,:\, \Theta \ge 0\}\,,$$

Now we define, on the set $\mathsf{Ext}_0(S)$, the semi-order $\preceq$ by (see e.g. [16], Section 3.3)

$$A_1 \preceq A_2 \iff \begin{cases} \mathscr{D}(F_{A_1}) \subseteq \mathscr{D}(F_{A_2})\,, \\ \forall\, \phi \in \mathscr{D}(F_{A_1})\,,\ F_{A_1}(\phi) \ge F_{A_2}(\phi)\,. \end{cases}$$

By Theorem 2.4, given $A_{(\Pi_1,\Theta_1)}$ and $A_{(\Pi_2,\Theta_2)}$ in $\mathsf{Ext}_0(S)$, one has

$$A_{(\Pi_1,\Theta_1)} \preceq A_{(\Pi_2,\Theta_2)} \iff (\Pi_1,\Theta_1) \preceq (\Pi_2,\Theta_2)$$

i.e.

$$A_{(\Pi_1,\Theta_1)} \preceq A_{(\Pi_2,\Theta_2)} \iff \begin{cases} \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_1,\Theta_1}) \subseteq \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_2,\Theta_2})\,, \\ \forall \xi \in \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_1,\Theta_1})\,,\ f_{\Pi_1,\Theta_1}(\xi) \ge f_{\Pi_2,\Theta_2}(\xi)\,. \end{cases}$$

Thus the Friedrichs' extension A_0 (corresponding to $\Pi = 0$) is the minimum element of $\mathsf{Ext}_0(S)$ and $A_K := A_{(1,0)}$ is the maximum one. The extension A_K, discovered by von Neuman in [33], is named *Kreĭn's extension*, after Kreĭn's seminal paper [25] characterizing the extremal elements of $\mathsf{Ext}_0(S)$.

Warning. From now on all the Hilbert spaces we consider are *real* Hilbert spaces.

2.5. **Dirichlet Forms.** Let us now suppose that $\mathscr{H} = L^2(X, \mathscr{B}, m)$ ($\equiv L^2(X)$ for short), where X is a locally compact separable metric space and m is a positive Radon measure on the Borel σ-algebra $\mathscr{B}$ of X such that $\mathrm{supp}(m) = X$, i.e. m is finite on compact sets and is strictly positive on non-empty open sets.

A negative self-adjoint operator A is said to be *Markovian* if

$$0 \le u \le 1\,,\ m\text{-a.e.} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \forall t > 0\,, \quad 0 \le e^{tA}u \le 1\,,\ m\text{-a.e.}\,.$$

By

$$e^{tA}u = \lim_{\lambda\uparrow\infty} e^{-\lambda t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\lambda t)^n}{n!}\,(\lambda R^A_\lambda)^n u\,, \quad R^A_\lambda u = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} e^{tA} u\, dt\,, \tag{2.13}$$

this is equivalent to

$$0 \le u \le 1\,,\ m\text{-a.e.} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \forall \lambda > 0\,, \quad 0 \le \lambda R^A_\lambda u \le 1\,,\ m\text{-a.e.}\,.$$

By [9], Theorem 1.4.1, if A is Markovian then $L^1(X)\cap L^\infty(X)$ is invariant under e^{tA} and $e^{tA}|L^1(X)\cap L^2(X)$ can be extended to a strongly continuous contraction semi-group on $L^p(X)$ for all $p\in[1,\infty)$.

A function $\Phi:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ is said to be a *normal contraction* if

$$\Phi(0)=0\quad\text{and}\quad|\Phi(t)-\Phi(s)|\le|t-s|\,.$$

A positive symmetric bilinear form

$$F:\mathscr{D}(F)\times\mathscr{D}(F)\subseteq L^2(X)\times L^2(X)\to\mathbb{R}$$

is said to be a *Markovian form* if for any normal contraction Φ one has

$$u\in\mathscr{D}(F)\implies\begin{cases}\Phi(u)\in\mathscr{D}(F)\,,\\ F(\Phi(u))\le F(u)\,,\end{cases}\tag{2.14}$$

where

$$[\Phi(u)](x):=\Phi(u(x))\,.$$

A closed Markovian form F is said to be a *Dirichlet form* and the Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}(F)$ given by the set $\mathscr{D}(F)$ equipped with the scalar product

$$\langle u,v\rangle_F:=F(u,v)+\langle u,v\rangle_{L^2(X)}$$

is the corresponding *Dirichlet space.*

Warning. Notice that, according to our definitions, Markovian and Dirichlet forms are not necessarily densely defined in $L^2(X)$. In particular, forms densely defined in $\mathscr{R}(\Pi)\neq L^2(X)$ of the kind $f_{\Pi,\Theta}$, $(\Pi,\Theta)\in\mathsf{E}(L^2(X))$, will be often regarded as forms on $L^2(X)$ with a not dense domain.

By [16], Theorem 2.1.1., one has

Theorem 2.7. *The closure of a closable Markovian form is a Dirichlet form.*

Moreover, by [16], Theorem 1.4.1, for closed forms the special normal contraction $\Phi(u)=u_\#$ suffices in (2.14):

Theorem 2.8. *A closed, symmetric bilinear form F is a Dirichlet form if and only if*

$$u\in\mathscr{D}(F)\implies\begin{cases}u_\#\in\mathscr{D}(F)\,,\\ F(u_\#)\le F(u)\,.\end{cases}$$

By Theorem 10 in [1] one has

Theorem 2.9. *Let F be a Dirichlet form and let Φ be any normal contraction. Then the map $u \mapsto \Phi(u)$ is continuous on the Dirichlet space $\mathscr{H}(F)$ to itself.*

The connection between Markovian operators and Dirichlet forms is given by the *Beurling-Deny criterion* (see e.g. [16], Theorem 1.4.1, [9], Theorem 1.3.3):

Theorem 2.10. *A is Markovian $\iff$ F_A is a densely defined Dirichlet form.*

Thus, posing

$$\mathsf{Ext}_{\rm M}(S) := \{A \in \mathsf{Ext}(S)\,:\, A \text{ is Markovian}\}\,,$$

one has, by Theorems 2.1 and 2.4,

$$\mathsf{Ext}_{\rm M}(S) = \{A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}\,:\, F_{(\Pi,\Theta)} \text{ is a Dirichlet form}\}\,. \tag{2.15}$$

2.6. **Yosida approximations.** Let F_A be the bilinear form associated with the positive self-adjoint operator $-A$ and let us consider the bounded bilinear symmetric form F_A^λ associated with the Yosida approximation of A, i.e.

$$F_A^\lambda : L^2(X) \times L^2(X) \to \mathbb{R}\,,$$
$$F_A^\lambda(u,v) := \langle u, \lambda(1 - \lambda R_\lambda^A)v\rangle_{L^2(X)}\,.$$

Then, by [16], Lemma 1.3.4, formulae (1.4.7)-(1.4.9) and Theorem 1.4.2, one has the following

Theorem 2.11. *For any $u \in L^2(X)$, the function $\lambda \mapsto F_A^\lambda(u)$ is non-decreasing,*

$$\mathscr{D}(F_A) = \{u \in L^2(X)\,:\, \lim_{\lambda\uparrow\infty} F_A^\lambda(u) < \infty\}\,,$$
$$F_A(u,v) = \lim_{\lambda\uparrow\infty} F_A^\lambda(u,v)\,.$$

Moreover, if A is Markovian, i.e. if F_A is a Dirichlet form, then F_A^λ is a Dirichlet form and

$$F_A^\lambda = \breve{F}_A^\lambda + \check{F}_A^\lambda\,,$$

where the bounded Dirichlet forms $\breve{F}_A^\lambda$ and $\check{F}_A^\lambda$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\breve{F}_A^\lambda(u,v) :=& \frac{\lambda}{2}\int_{X\times X} (u(x)-u(y))(v(x)-v(y))\,d\sigma_A^\lambda(x,y)\\ \check{F}_A^\lambda(u,v) :=& \lambda\int_X u(x)v(x)s_A^\lambda(x)\,dm(x)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Here $0 \le s_A^\lambda \le 1$ *and* σ_A^λ *is a positive, symmetric, Radon measure on* $X \times X$.

Remark 2.12. If F_A is a Dirichlet form, by Theorem 1.4.2 in [16],

$$u \in L^\infty(X,m) \cap \mathscr{D}(F_A) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad u^2 \in \mathscr{D}(F_A)$$

and

$$u \in \mathscr{D}(F_A) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} u_n \in \mathscr{D}(F_A) \\ F_A(u) = \lim_{n\uparrow\infty} F_A(u_n)\,, \end{cases}$$

where $u_n := ((-n) \vee u) \wedge n$. Thus if $m(X) < \infty$ then

$$F_A(u) = \lim_{n\uparrow\infty} \lim_{\lambda\uparrow\infty} \left(\breve{F}_A^\lambda(u_n) + F_A^\lambda(1, u_n^2) \right) \tag{2.16}$$

and, if moreover $1 \in \mathscr{D}(F_A)$,

$$F_A(u) = \lim_{n\uparrow\infty} \left(\lim_{\lambda\uparrow\infty} \breve{F}_A^\lambda(u_n) + F_A(1, u_n^2) \right) . \tag{2.17}$$

2.7. **Capacity and quasi continuity.** Let F be a densly defined Dirichlet form. For any open set $\mathcal{O} \subseteq X$ we define its *F-capacity* by (see [16], section 3.1)

$$\mathrm{cap}_F(\mathcal{O}) := \inf\{\langle u,u\rangle_F\,,\ u \in \mathscr{D}(F)\,,\ u \ge 1 \ m\text{-a.e. on } \mathcal{O}\}\,.$$

Here, as usual, one poses $\inf(\emptyset) = +\infty$. For an arbitrary set $\mathcal{B} \subseteq X$ one then defines

$$\mathrm{cap}_F(\mathcal{B}) := \inf\{\mathrm{cap}_F(\mathcal{O})\,,\ \mathcal{O} \text{ open},\ \mathcal{O} \supset \mathcal{B}\}\,.$$

Such definitions provide a Choquet capacity (see [16], Theorem 3.1.1).

A statement is said to hold *quasi everywhere* (q.e. for short) if there exists a set $\mathcal{N}$ of zero capacity such that the statement is true outside $\mathcal{N}$. Notice that

$$\mathrm{cap}_F(\mathcal{N}) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad m(\mathcal{N}) = 0\,.$$

Also notice that if $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $F(u,v) = \langle \nabla u, \nabla v\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}$ with $\mathscr{D}(F) = H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) = \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) : \|\nabla u\| \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)\}$, then cap_F is the usual Newtonian capacity.

Given an extended real valued function u on X, we call it *quasi continuous* if for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an open set $\mathcal{O}_\epsilon \subset X$ such that $\mathrm{cap}_F(\mathcal{O}_\epsilon) < \epsilon$ and the restriction of u to $X\backslash\mathcal{O}_\epsilon$ is finite continuous.

Given a function u, $\tilde{u}$ is said to be a *quasi continuous modification* of u if $\tilde{u}$ is quasi continuous and $\tilde{u} = u$ m-a.e.. By [16], Theorem 3.1.3, one has

Theorem 2.13. *Any* $u \in \mathscr{D}(F)$ *has a quasi continuos modification.*

2.8. **The Beurling-Deny Decomposition.** A densely defined Dirichlet form F is said to be *regular on* X if $\mathscr{D}(F)\cap C_c(X)$ is both $\mathscr{H}(F)$-dense in $\mathscr{D}(F)$ and $L^\infty(X)$-dense in $C_c(X)$ (here $C_c(X)$ denotes the set of continuos function with compact support). For regular Dirichlet forms Beurling-Deny decomposition holds (see [3], [16], Theorem 2.2.1, [8], Theorem 4.3.3):

Theorem 2.14. *Any regular Dirichlet form F on $L^2(X)$ admits, for any $u,v\in\mathscr{D}(F)$ the decomposition*

$$F(u,v)=F^{(c)}(u,v)+F^{(j)}(u,v)+F^{(k)}(u,v)\,.$$

Here $F^{(c)}$ is a Markovian form which satisfies the strongly local property, i.e. $F^{(c)}(u,v)=0$ whenever u has a compact support and v is constant on a neighborhood of the support of u;

$$F^{(j)}(u,v)=\int_{X\times X}(\tilde u(x)-\tilde u(y))(\tilde v(x)-\tilde v(y))\,dJ(x,y)\,,$$

$$F^{(k)}(u,v)=\int_X\tilde u(x)\tilde v(x)\,d\kappa(x)\,,$$

where $\tilde u$ and $\tilde v$ denote quasi continuos versions of u and v, J is a symmetric positive Radon measure on $X\times X$ off the diagonal and κ is a positive Radon measure on X.

In the case X has a differential structure, i.e. $X=\Omega\subseteq\mathbb{R}^n$ more can be said about $F^{(c)}$ (see [42], Theorem 16.1, [17], Theorem 3.2.3):

Theorem 2.15. *Let F a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(\Omega)$. Then for any $u,v\in C_c^\infty(\Omega)\cap\mathscr{D}(F)$ one has*

$$F^{(c)}(u,v)=\sum_{1\le i,j\le n}\int_\Omega\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\,\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_j}\,d\nu_{ij}\,,$$

where the ν_{ij}'s are positive Radon measures on Ω such that, for any $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^n$ and for any compact $K\subset\Omega$,

$$\sum_{1\le i,j\le n}\nu_{ij}(K)\xi_i\xi_j\ge 0\,,\qquad \nu_{ij}(K)=\nu_{ji}(K)\,.$$

2.9. **Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities, ultracontractivity and heat kernel estimates.** Let F_A be a densely defined Dirichlet Form on $L^2(X)$. Let us denote by $\kappa_A(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ the integral kernel of e^{tA}. Here we briefly recall the connections between certain functional inequalities involving F_A, bondedness of e^{tA} from $L^2(X)$ to $L^\infty(X)\cap L^2(X)$ and estimates on κ_A (see e.g. [9], [20], [47] for proofs, more details and further results) .

We say that F_A satisfies a *logarithmic Sobolev inequality* (with function β) if there exist a continuous monotone decreasing function β such that for all $\epsilon > 0$ and for all positive $u \in \mathscr{D}(F_A) \cap L^1(X) \cap L^\infty(X)$ there holds

$$\int_X u^2 \log u^2 \, dm \le \epsilon F_A(u) + \beta(\epsilon) \|u\|^2_{L^2(X)} + \|u\|^2_{L^2(X)} \log \|u\|^2_{L^2(X)} .$$

If F_A satisfies a logarithmic Sobolev inequality with function β such that $m(t) := \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \beta(\epsilon)\, d\epsilon$ is finite for any $t > 0$ then (see [9], Corollary 2.2.8) e^{tA} is *ultracontractive* (with function m), i.e.

$$\forall t > 0\,, \ \forall u \in L^2(X)\,, \quad \|e^{tA} u\|_{L^\infty(X)} \le e^{m(t)} \|u\|_{L^2(X)}\,.$$

Conversely (see [9], Theorem 2.2.3) if e^{tA} is ultracontractive with a continuous monotone decreasing function m then F_A satisfies a logarithmic Sobolev inequality with function $\beta = m$. Moreover (see [9], Lemma 2.1.2) ultracontractivity with function m implies the heat kernel estimate

$$\forall t > 0\,, \ \text{for } m\text{-a.e. } x \text{ and } y, \quad \kappa_A(t, x, y) \le e^{2m(t/2)}\,.$$

Conversely the estimate $\kappa_A(t, x, y) \le e^{m(t)}$ implies ultracontractivity (and hence a logarithnic Sobolev inequality) with function $m/2$.

If $m(X) < \infty$ and e^{tA} is ultracontractive then (see [9], Theorem 2.1.4)

$$\forall t > 0\,, \quad \text{trace}(e^{tA}) < +\infty \tag{2.18}$$

and (see [9], Theorem 2.1.5) e^{tA} is compact on $L^p(X)$ for any $p \in [1, \infty]$. Moreover any eigenfunction v_n of A is in $L^\infty(X)$ and

$$\kappa_A(t, x, y) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\lambda_n t} v_n(x) v_n(y)\,,$$

where λ_n is the eigenvalue corresponding to v_n and the series converges uniformly on $[t_\circ, \infty) \times X \times X$ for any $t_\circ > 0$.

2.10. **Dirichlet Forms and Hunt Processes.** Here we briefly recall the one-to-one correspondence between regular Dirichlet forms and Markov processes. We refer to [15], [16], [17] and [8] for more details and proofs.

Let the Dirichlet form F_A be regular on X and let e^{tA}, $t \ge 0$, be the semi-group on $L^2(X)$ generated by the corresponding Markovian operator A. Then there exists an (unique in law) X_∂-valued, *Hunt Markov process* $\mathsf{Z}_A = (\{\mathsf{Z}_t\}_{t \ge 0}, \{\mathsf{P}_x\}_{x \in X})$ such that

$$\forall u \in L^2(X)\,, \quad e^{tA} u(x) = \mathsf{E}_x(u(\mathsf{Z}_t))\,, \ \text{for q.e. } x \in X, \tag{2.19}$$

where E_x denotes expectation with respect to the probability measure P_x. Here $X_\partial := X \cup \{\partial\}$ (∂ is the "cemetery"), $\mathsf{Z}_t(\omega) = \partial$ for every $t \geq \zeta(\omega)$, where the lifetime ζ is defined by $\zeta(\omega) := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \mathsf{Z}_t(\omega) = \partial\}$, and $u(\partial) := 0$.

The trajectories of Z_A are almost surely right-continuos with left limits. If F_A has the *local property*, i.e. if $F_A(u, v) = 0$ for any couple $u, v \in \mathscr{D}(F_A)$ with compact disjoint supports, then Z_A is a *Diffusion*, i.e. its trajectories are almost surely continuous. Notice that by the Beurling-Deny decomposition Z_A is a diffusion if and only if $F_A^{(j)} = 0$.

2.11. Dirichlet Forms and paths behavior.

Some analytical properties of the Dirichlet form F_A and the corresponding resolvents R_λ^A and semigroups e^{tA} correlate with paths behavior of Z_A. Here we recall the main results following [17] and [8] to which we refer for more details and proofs. For simplicity from now on in this subsection we suppose that $m(X) < \infty$.

The Markovian operator A is said to be *conservative* if $\lambda R_\lambda^A 1 = 1$ m-a.e. for all $\lambda > 0$. By (2.13) this is equivalent to $e^{tA}1 = 1$ m-a.e. for all $t > 0$.

By (2.19) and [17], exercise 4.5.1, one has

$$A \text{ is conservative} \iff \forall x \in X\,, \quad \mathsf{P}_x(\zeta = +\infty) = 1\,. \tag{2.20}$$

Denoting by $\tilde{R}_\lambda^A$, $\lambda > 0$, the extension to $L^1(X)$ of the resolvent and posing, for m-a.e. $x \in X$, and for all positive $u \in L^1(X)$,

$$\tilde{R}^A u(x) := \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \tilde{R}_\lambda^A u(x)\,,$$

A is said to be *transient* if

$$\forall u \in L^1(X)\,,\ u \geq 0 \ m\text{-a.e.}\,, \quad m(x \in X\ :\ \tilde{R}^A u(x) = +\infty) = 0\,.$$

and is said to be *recurrent* if

$$\forall u \in L^1(X)\,,\ u \geq 0 \ m\text{-a.e.}\,, \quad m(x \in X\ :\ 0 < \tilde{R}^A u(x) < +\infty) = 0\,.$$

By Theorem 2.11, if A is conservative then $1 \in \mathscr{D}(F_A)$ and $F_A(1) = 0$. By [17], Theorem 1.6.3, this implies that A is recurrent. Since, by [8], Theorem 2.1.10, recurrence implies conservativeness, in conclusion we get

$$A \text{ conservative} \iff A \text{ recurrent} \iff 1 \in \mathscr{D}(F_A) \text{ and } F_A(1) = 0. \tag{2.21}$$

By [8], Theorems 2.1.5 and 3.5.2, if A is transient then

$$\mathsf{P}_x(\zeta = +\infty\,,\ \lim_{t \uparrow \infty} \mathsf{Z}_t = \partial) = \mathsf{P}_x(\zeta = +\infty)\,, \quad \text{for q.e. } x \in X\,.$$

A Markov operator A is said to be *irreducible* if

$$\forall u \in L^2(X)\,, \forall t>0\,,\ e^{tA}(1_B u) = 1_B e^{tA} u \implies m(B)m(B^c) = 0\,.$$

If A is irreducible and if the bottom of its spectrum is an eigenvalue, then such an eigenvalue is simple and the corresponding eigenfunction is strictly positive m-a.e. (see e.g. [9], Proposition 1.4.3).

By [17], Lemma 1.6.4,

$$A \text{ irreducible} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad A \text{ either recurrent or transient.} \tag{2.22}$$

By [8], Theorem 2.1.11, if A is recurrent then

$$A \text{ irreducible} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad u \text{ is } m\text{-a.e. constant whenever } F_A(u) = 0\ . \tag{2.23}$$

By [8], Theorem 3.5.6, if A is irreducible then

$$\mathsf{P}_x(\sigma_{\mathcal{B}} < +\infty) > 0\,, \quad \text{for q.e. } x \in X$$

and if A is irreducible and recurrent then

$$\mathsf{P}_x(\sigma_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \theta_n < +\infty \text{ for every } n \geq 0) = 1\,, \quad \text{for q.e. } x \in X\,.$$

Here $\mathcal{B}$ is any Borel set with strictly positive F_A-capacity, $\sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$ denotes the first hitting time of $\mathcal{B}$, i.e. $\sigma_{\mathcal{B}} := \inf\{t > 0 : \mathsf{Z}_t \in \mathcal{B}\}$, and θ_n is the time shift $\mathsf{Z}_t \circ \theta_s = \mathsf{Z}_{t+s}$.

3. MARKOVIAN EXTENSIONS - A TOY EXAMPLE

Let $S = A_{\min}$ be the negative, symmetric linear operator given by the minimal realization of $\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ on the finite interval $(0,\ell)$:

$$A_{\min} : C_c^\infty(0,\ell) \subseteq L^2(0,\ell) \to L^2(0,\ell)\,, \qquad A_{\min} u = \frac{d^2 u}{dx^2}\,.$$

Its Friedrichs' extension is given by

$$A_D : H^2(0,\ell) \cap H_0^1(0,\ell) \subseteq L^2(0,\ell) \to L^2(0,\ell)\,, \quad A_D u = \frac{d^2 u}{dx^2}\,,$$

with corresponding bilinear form

$$F_D : H_0^1(0,\ell) \times H_0^1(0,\ell) \subseteq L^2(0,\ell) \times L^2(0,\ell) \to \mathbb{R}\,,$$

$$F_D(u,v) = \left\langle \frac{du}{dx}, \frac{dv}{dx} \right\rangle \equiv \int_0^\ell \frac{du}{dx}\frac{dv}{dx}\,dx\,.$$

Here the index D stands for Dirichlet boundary conditions. $H^n(0,\ell)$ denotes the usual Sobolev-Hilbert space of square integrable functions with square integrable distributional derivatives up to the n-th order and

$$H_0^1(0,\ell) := \left\{u \in H^1(0,\ell)\ :\ \gamma_0 u = 0\right\}\ ,$$

$$\gamma_0 : H^1(0,\ell) \to \mathbb{R}^2\,, \qquad \gamma_0 u := (u(0), u(\ell))\ ,$$

By Sobolev embedding theorems one has $H^n(0,\ell)\subset C^{n-1}[0,\ell]$.

The closure of $A_{\min}$ is given by

$$A^{**}_{\min}: H^2_0(0,\ell)\subseteq L^2(0,\ell)\to L^2(0,\ell)\,,\qquad A^{**}_{\min}u=\frac{d^2u}{dx^2}\,,$$

where

$$H^2_0(0,\ell):=\left\{u\in H^2(0,\ell)\,:\,\gamma_0 u=\gamma_1 u=0\right\}\,,$$

$$\gamma_1: H^2(0,\ell)\to\mathbb{R}^2\,,\qquad \gamma_1 u:=\left(\frac{du}{dx}(0),-\frac{du}{dx}(\ell)\right)\,,$$

and in order to find all self-adjoint extensions of $A_{\min}$ together with the corresponding bilinear forms we can apply Theorems 2.1 and 2.4 with

$$A_0=A_D\,,\quad F_0=F_D\,,\quad \mathfrak{h}=\mathbb{R}^2\,,\quad \tau=\gamma_1|H^2(0,\ell)\cap H^1_0(0,\ell)\,.$$

By

$$R^D_0u(x)\equiv(-A_D)^{-1}\,u(x)=\frac{\ell-x}{\ell}\int_0^x y\,u(y)\,dy+\frac{x}{\ell}\int_x^\ell(\ell-y)\,u(y)\,dy\,,$$

and, for $\lambda>0$,

$$R^D_\lambda u(x)\equiv(-A_D+\lambda)^{-1}\,u(x)=\frac{\sinh(\sqrt{\lambda}\,(\ell-x))}{\sqrt{\lambda}\sinh(\sqrt{\lambda}\,\ell)}\int_0^x\sinh(\sqrt{\lambda}\,y)\,u(y)\,dy$$
$$+\frac{\sinh(\sqrt{\lambda}\,x)}{\sqrt{\lambda}\sinh(\sqrt{\lambda}\,\ell)}\int_x^\ell\sinh(\sqrt{\lambda}\,(\ell-y))\,u(y)\,dy\,,$$

one obtains (here $\xi\equiv(\xi_1,\xi_2)$)

$$G_0:\mathbb{R}^2\to L^2(0,\ell)\,,\quad G_0\xi(x)=\frac{x}{\ell}\,(\xi_2-\xi_1)+\xi_1\,,$$

and, for $\lambda>0$,

$$G_\lambda:\mathbb{R}^2\to L^2(0,\ell)\,,\quad G_\lambda\xi(x)=\frac{\sinh(\sqrt{\lambda}\,(\ell-x))}{\sinh(\sqrt{\lambda}\,\ell)}\,\xi_1+\frac{\sinh(\sqrt{\lambda}\,x)}{\sinh(\sqrt{\lambda}\,\ell)}\,\xi_2\,.$$

Since $G_0\xi\notin H^1_0(0,\ell)$ for any $\xi\neq0$, hypothesis (2.12) holds. Thus, by Theorem 2.4, the bilinear forms corresponding to the self-adjoint extensions of $A_{\min}$ are of the kind

$$F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}:\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})\times\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})\subseteq L^2(0,\ell)\times L^2(0,\ell)\to\mathbb{R}\,,$$

$$F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}(u,v)=\left\langle\frac{du_0}{dx},\frac{dv_0}{dx}\right\rangle+f_{\Pi,\Theta}(\xi_u,\xi_v,)\,,$$

$$\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})=\{u\in H^1(0,\ell)\,:\,u=u_0+G_0\xi_u\,,\;u_0\in H^1(0,\ell)\,,\;\xi_u\in\mathscr{R}(\Pi)\}\,,$$

where

$$f_{\Pi,\Theta}:\mathscr{R}(\Pi)\times\mathscr{R}(\Pi)\to\mathbb{R}\,,$$

is the bilinear form on $\mathscr{R}(\Pi)$ corresponding to Θ and $(\Pi,\Theta)\in\mathsf{E}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. By straightforward calculations, integrating by parts, by $\frac{d^2}{dx^2}(G_0\xi)=0$ and by

$$\gamma_0 u=\gamma_0(u_0+G_0\xi_u)=\gamma_0 G_0\xi_u=\xi_u\,,$$

one obtains

$$\left\langle\frac{du_0}{dx},\frac{dv_0}{dx}\right\rangle=\left\langle\frac{du}{dx},\frac{dv}{dx}\right\rangle+\langle P_0\xi_u,\xi_v\rangle\,,$$

where

$$P_\lambda:\mathbb{R}^2\to\mathbb{R}^2\,,\quad \lambda\ge 0\,,$$

is the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator

$$P_\lambda\xi:=\gamma_1 u_\xi\,,\quad \begin{cases}\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\,u_\xi=\lambda u_\xi\\ \gamma_0 u_\xi=\xi\,,\end{cases}$$

i.e.

$$P_\lambda\equiv\frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\sinh\sqrt{\lambda}\,\ell}\begin{pmatrix}-\cosh\sqrt{\lambda}\,\ell & 1\\ 1 & -\cosh\sqrt{\lambda}\,\ell\end{pmatrix}\,,\quad \lambda>0\,,$$

$$P_0\equiv\frac{1}{\ell}\begin{pmatrix}-1 & 1\\ 1 & -1\end{pmatrix}\,.$$

Noticing that any $u\in H^1(0,\ell)$ can be decomposed as $u=u_0+G_0\gamma_0 u$, where $u_0\in H^1_0(0,\ell)$ is defined by $u_0:=u-G_0\gamma_0 u$, in conclusion one has that, for any $(\Pi,\Theta)\in\mathsf{E}(\mathbb{R}^2)$,

$$F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}(u,v)=F_N(u,v)+f_{\Pi,B_\Theta}(\gamma_0 u,\gamma_0 v)\,,$$

$$\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})=\{u\in H^1(0,\ell)\,:\gamma_0 u\in\mathscr{R}(\Pi)\}\,,$$

where

$$F_N:H^1(0,\ell)\times H^1(0,\ell)\subseteq L^2(0,\ell)\times L^2(0,\ell)\to\mathbb{R}\,,$$

$$F_N(u,v)=\left\langle\frac{du}{dx},\frac{du}{dx}\right\rangle\,,$$

and

$$B_\Theta:\mathscr{R}(\Pi)\to\mathscr{R}(\Pi)\,,\quad B_\Theta:=\Pi P_0\Pi+\Theta\,.$$

Here the index N stands for Neumann, since the self-adjoint operator A_N associated with F_N corresponds to Neumann boundary conditions.

Then, posing

$$\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)}:=A_{(\Pi,\Theta_B)}\,,\qquad \Theta_B:=B-\Pi P_0\Pi\,,$$

by Theorem 2.1 one obtains (see Example 5.1 in [37]) the following

Theorem 3.1. $\mathsf{Ext}(A_{\min}) = \{\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)}\,,\ (\Pi,B)\in\mathsf{E}(\mathbb{R}^2)\}$, *where*

$$\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)} : \mathscr{D}(\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)}) \subseteq L^2(0,\ell) \to L^2(0,\ell)\,, \qquad \tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)}u = \frac{d^2u}{dx^2}\,,$$

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)}) = \left\{u \in H^2(0,\ell)\,:\, \gamma_0 u \in \mathscr{R}(\Pi)\,,\quad \Pi\gamma_1 u = B\gamma_0 u\right\}\,.$$

Remark 3.2. Notice that the case $\Pi = 0$ corresponds to Dirichlet boundary conditions, the case $\Pi = 1$, posing

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} \\ b_{12} & b_{22} \end{pmatrix}\,, \quad b_{ij}\in\mathbb{R}\,,$$

correspond to the boundary conditions

$$\frac{du}{dx}(0) = b_{11}\,u(0) + b_{12}\,u(\ell)\,, \qquad -\frac{du}{dx}(\ell) = b_{12}\,u(0) + b_{22}\,u(\ell)\,, \tag{3.1}$$

and the case $\Pi = v\otimes v$, $v\equiv(v_1,v_2)\in\mathbb{R}^2$, $v_1^2+v_2^2=1$, $B=b\in\mathbb{R}$, corresponds to the boundary conditions

$$v_2\,u(0) = v_1\,u(\ell)\,, \qquad v_1\left(\frac{du}{dx}(0) - b\,u(0)\right) = v_2\left(\frac{du}{dx}(\ell) + b\,u(\ell)\right)\,. \tag{3.2}$$

The boundary conditions (3.2) can be re-written (when $bv_1v_2 \neq 0$) as

$$\frac{b}{v_1}\,u(0) = \frac{b}{v_2}\,u(\ell) = v_1\frac{du}{dx}(0) - v_2\frac{du}{dx}(\ell)\,. \tag{3.3}$$

Remark 3.3. The boundary conditions (3.1) and (3.3) coincide with the ones obtained (in the case of more general second order differential operators) by Feller in [12], Theorem 10.1.

Lemma 3.4. *1. In the case* $\Pi = 1$

$$f_B : \mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}\,, \qquad f_B(\xi,\zeta) := b_{11}\xi_1\zeta_1 + b_{12}(\xi_1\zeta_2 + \zeta_1\xi_2) + b_{22}\xi_2\zeta_2$$

is Dirichlet form on $\mathbb{R}^2$ *if and only if*

$$b_{11}+b_{12}\geq 0\,, \quad b_{12}+b_{22}\geq 0\,, \quad b_{12}\leq 0\,.$$

2. In the case $\Pi = v\otimes v$

$$f_B : \mathscr{R}(\Pi)\times\mathscr{R}(\Pi) \subset \mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}\,, \qquad f_{\Pi,B}(\xi v,\zeta v) := b\,\xi\zeta$$

is a Dirichlet form on $\mathbb{R}^2$ *with domain* $\mathscr{R}(\Pi)$ *if and only if* $b \geq 0$ *and* v *is one of the following unit vectors:*

$$\mathrm{e}_0 \equiv \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\,, \quad \mathrm{e}_1 \equiv (1,0)\,, \quad \mathrm{e}_2 \equiv (0,1)\,.$$

Proof. 1. Let $\Pi = \mathbf{1}$. The thesis follows by Theorem 2.10 and by the well known characterization of generators of Markovian semigroups on a finite (or countable) set (see e.g. [10], Theorem 12.3.2).

2. Let $\Pi = v \otimes v$, $v \equiv (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $v_1^2 + v_2^2 = 1$. If $v = \mathrm{e}_i$, $i = 0, 1, 2$ then $(cv)_\# \in \mathscr{R}(\Pi)$ for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Conversely suppose that $v \notin \mathscr{R}(\mathrm{e}_i \otimes \mathrm{e}_i)$, $i = 0, 1, 2$, so that $v_1 v_2 \neq 0$ and $v_1 \neq v_2$. If $v_1 v_2 < 0$ then $v_\# \notin \mathscr{R}(\Pi)$; if $v_1 v_2 > 0$ then, posing $c = \mathrm{sign}(v_1)/(|v_1| \wedge |v_2|)$, $(cv)_\# \equiv (1, 1) \notin \mathscr{R}(\Pi)$. Finally notice that $f_{\Pi,B} \geq 0 \iff b \geq 0$. □

Theorem 3.5. *Let* $\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}$ *be the bilinear form associated with* $-\tilde A_{(\Pi,B)}$. *Then* $\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}$ *is a Dirichlet form if and only if* $f_{\Pi,B}$ *is a Dirichlet form on* $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Proof. At first notice that the bilinear form F_N is a Dirichlet form. Thus if $f_{\Pi,B}$ is a Dirichlet form then, since $(\gamma_0 u)_\# = \gamma_0 u_\#$ by $H^1(0,\ell) \subset C[0,\ell]$, one has

$$u \in \mathscr{D}(\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad u_\# \in \mathscr{D}(\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)})$$

and

$$\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}(u_\#) = F_N(u_\#) + f_{\Pi,B}((\gamma_0 u)_\#) \leq F_N(u) + f_{\Pi,B}(\gamma_0 u) = \tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}(u)\,.$$

Therefore $\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}$ is a Dirichlet form.

Suppose now that $f_{\Pi,B}$ is not a Dirichlet form.

Case $\Pi = \mathbf{1}$. Let $u = G_0 \xi$, with $\xi \equiv (1+\epsilon, 1)$, $\epsilon > 0$. Then

$$f_B(\xi_\#) - f_B(\xi) = -2(b_{11} + b_{12})\epsilon - b_{11}\epsilon^2$$

and

$$F_N(u) - F_N(u_\#) = F_N(u) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{\ell}\,.$$

Thus if $b_{11} + b_{12} < 0$ then $\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}(u_\#) > \tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}(u)$ by taking ϵ sufficiently small. The same kind of reasoning holds in the case $b_{12} + b_{22} < 0$ taking $\xi \equiv (1, 1+\epsilon)$. Let

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{2}{\ell}\,x\,, & 0 < x \leq \frac{\ell}{2} \\ \epsilon\,\left(1 - \frac{2}{\ell}\,x\right)\,, & \frac{\ell}{2} < x < \ell\,. \end{cases}$$

Then $\gamma_0 u \equiv (1, -\epsilon)$,

$$f_B(\gamma_0 u_\#) - f_B(\gamma_0 u) = 2b_{12}\epsilon - b_{22}\epsilon^2$$

and

$$F_N(u) - F_N(u_\#) = \frac{2}{\ell}\,\epsilon^2\,.$$

Thus if $b_{12} > 0$ then $\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}(u_\#) > \tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}(u)$ by taking ϵ sufficiently small.

Case $\Pi = v \otimes v$. Suppose $\xi \neq \mathrm{e}_i$, $i = 0, 1, 2$. Then taking $u = G_0\xi$, one has $\gamma_0 u_\# = \xi \notin \mathscr{R}(\Pi)$, and so $u_\# \notin \mathscr{D}(\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)})$.

Suppose $u = G_0\mathrm{e}_0$ and $b < 0$. Then

$$\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}(u) = f_{\Pi,B}(e_0) = b < 0\,.$$

Let

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{\ell}\, x\,, & 0 < x \leq \frac{\ell}{2} \\ \epsilon\, \left(\frac{2}{\ell}\, x - 1\right) + 1\,, & \frac{\ell}{2} < x < \ell\,. \end{cases}$$

Then $\gamma_0 u = (1 + \epsilon)\mathrm{e}_2$, $u \in \mathscr{D}(\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)})$, and

$$f_{\Pi,B}(\gamma_0 u_\#) - f_{\Pi,B}(\gamma_0 u) = -b(2 + \epsilon)\epsilon$$

$$F_N(u) - F_N(u_\#) = \frac{2}{\ell}\,\epsilon^2\,.$$

Thus if $b < 0$ then $\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}(u_\#) > \tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}(u)$ by taking ϵ sufficiently small. The case in which $v = \mathrm{e}_1$ is treated similarly. □

Remark 3.6. If $\Pi = \mathsf{0}$ then $\tilde{F}_{(\mathsf{0})} = F_D$ and such Dirichlet form is regular on $X = (0, \ell)$. When $\Pi \neq \mathsf{0}$, by the continuous embedding $H^1(0, \ell) \subset C[0, \ell]$ and by

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}) = \{u = u_0 + G_0\xi_u\,,\ u_0 \in H^1_0(0, \ell)\,,\ \xi_u \in \mathscr{R}(\Pi)\}\,,$$

$$\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}(u, v) = F_N(u, v) + B\xi_u{\cdot}\xi_v\,,$$

it is immediate to check that $\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}$ is always regular on $X = [0, \ell]$. It suffices to approximate (with respect to $H^1(0, \ell)$-convergence) the component u_0 by a sequence in $C^\infty_0(0, \ell)$.

Corollary 3.7. *A bilinear form F on $L^2(0, \ell)$ is the bilinear form of a Markovian self-adjoint extension of $A_{\min}$ if and only if $\mathscr{D}(F) \subseteq H^1(0, \ell)$ and there exists a Dirichlet form f_b on $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that*

$$\mathscr{D}(F) = \{u \in H^1(0, \ell) : \gamma_0 u \in \mathscr{D}(f_b)\}$$

and

$$F(u, v) = F_N(u, v) + f_b(\gamma_0 u, \gamma_0 v)\,.$$

By Kreĭn's resolvent formula (2.3) and by

$$\begin{aligned} &\Theta_B + \lambda\Pi G_0^* G_\lambda \Pi = \Theta_B + \Pi\gamma_1(G_0 - G_\lambda)\Pi \\ =&\Theta_B + \Pi(P_0 - P_\lambda)\Pi = B - \Pi P_\lambda \Pi\,, \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 3.7 has an equivalent version in terms of resolvents:

Corollary 3.8. *$R_\lambda \in \mathsf{B}(L^2(0,\ell))$, $\lambda > 0$, is the resolvent of a Markovian extension of $A_{\min}$ if and only if*

$$R_\lambda = R_\lambda^D + G_\lambda \Pi (B - \Pi P_\lambda \Pi)^{-1} \Pi G_\lambda^* \,,$$

where $f_{\Pi,B}$ is a Dirichlet form on $\mathbb{R}^2$.

By combining Theorem 2.10 with Lemma 3.4 one obtains the following

Theorem 3.9. *$A \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ if and only if $A = \tilde A_{(\Pi,B)}$, with $(\Pi, B) \in \mathsf{E}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying one of the following conditions:*

(1) $\Pi = 0$;

(2) $\Pi = 1\,, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} b_{12} & b_{12} \\ b_{12} & b_{22} \end{pmatrix}\,,\ b_{11}+b_{12} \ge 0\,,\ b_{12}+b_{22} \ge 0\,,\ b_{12} \le 0\,;$

(3) $\Pi = v \otimes v\,, \quad v \in \{\mathrm{e}_0\,, \mathrm{e}_1\,, \mathrm{e}_2\}\,, \quad B = b \ge 0\,.$

Remark 3.10. Notice that A_N is the maximum element of $\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ and that it does not coincide with the Kreĭn's extension A_K.

Remark 3.11. The above theorem reproduces, if $\Pi = 1$, the results obtained (in the case of more general second order differential operators) by Feller in [12], Theorem 10.2. If $\Pi = v \otimes v$ our results differ from the ones stated by Feller in the same theorem. However looking at the proof of Feller's theorem, the arguments there seems to lead to our results.

Remark 3.12. Notice that the cases $\Pi = \mathrm{e}_i \otimes \mathrm{e}_i$, $B = 0$, $i = 1, 2$, give mixed (Dirichlet-Neumann) boundary conditions, while the case $\Pi = \mathrm{e}_0 \otimes \mathrm{e}_0$, $B = 0$ gives the self-adjoint extension corresponding to the Laplacian on the circle of radius $\ell/2\pi$.

Remark 3.13. By (2.21), Lemma 3.4 and Theorem 3.5 one has that $\tilde A_{(\Pi,B)}$ is a conservative Dirichlet form if and only if either $(\Pi, B) = (1\,, -bP_0)$, $b \ge 0$, or $(\Pi, B) = (\mathrm{e}_0 \otimes \mathrm{e}_0, 0)$.

Remark 3.14. Notice that while

$$f_{\Pi,B} \quad \text{Dirichlet} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad f_{\Pi,\Theta_B} \quad \text{Dirichlet,}$$

the converse is not true: for example (here for simplicity we pose $\ell = 1$), taking $\Pi = 1$ and

$$\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1/2 \\ -1/2 & 2 \end{pmatrix}\,,$$

f_Θ is a Dirichlet form whereas f_{B_Θ} is positive but is not a Dirichlet form. Hence $f_{\Pi,\Theta}$ Dirichlet is a necessary but not sufficient condition for $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ being Markovian. This elementary example, together with

Theorem 3.5, shows that the correct description of the set of Markovian extensions $\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ in terms of the parametrizing couples (Π, Θ) is the following:

Theorem 3.15. $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)} \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ *if and only if*

$$f_{\Pi,\Theta} : \mathscr{R}(\Pi) \times \mathscr{R}(\Pi) \to \mathbb{R}$$

is a Dirichlet form on $\mathbb{R}^2$ *which admits the decomposition*

$$f_{\Pi,\Theta}(\xi_1, \xi_2) = f_{\Pi,B}(\xi_1, \xi_2) - P_0\xi_1 \cdot \xi_2 \,,$$

where

$$f_{\Pi,B} : \mathscr{R}(\Pi) \times \mathscr{R}(\Pi) \to \mathbb{R}$$

is a Dirichlet form on $\mathbb{R}^2$*.*

4. Markovian extensions of elliptic operators

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n > 1$, a bounded open set with a smooth boundary Γ. We suppose that Ω is connected, otherwise we work on each connected component separately.

Given the differential expression

$$\nabla \cdot a \nabla \equiv \sum_{1 \le i,j \le n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(a_{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \right) .$$

we suppose that the real-valued matrix $a(x) \equiv (a_{ij}(x))$ is symmetric, that $a_{ij} \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ and that there exist $0 < \mu_0 \le \mu_1 < +\infty$ such that

$$\forall x \in \Omega \,, \ \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \,, \qquad \mu_0 \|\xi\|^2 \le \sum_{1 \le i,j \le n} a_{ij}(x) \xi_i \xi_j \le \mu_1 \|\xi\|^2 \,.$$

We denote by $H^k(\Omega)$ the Sobolev-Hilbert space given by closure of $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ with respect to the norm

$$\|u\|^2_{H^k(\Omega)} = \sum_{0 \le \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n \le k} \left\| \frac{\partial^{\alpha_1}}{\partial x_1^{\alpha_1}} \cdots \frac{\partial^{\alpha_n} u}{\partial x_n^{\alpha_n}} \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} .$$

Then the spaces $H^s(\Omega)$, $s \ge 0$ real, can be defined by interpolation as $H^s(\Omega) := [H^k(\Omega), L^2(\Omega)]_\theta$, $(1-\theta)k = s$, $0 < \theta < 1$. Alternatively $H^s(\Omega)$ can be defined as the space of restrictions to Ω of the elements of $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the latter defined by Fourier transform.

$H^s_0(\Omega)$, $s > 0$, denotes the closure of $C^\infty_c(\Omega)$ with respect to the $H^s(\Omega)$-norm. If $0 < s \le 1/2$ then $H^s_0(\Omega) = H^s(\Omega)$, otherwise $H^s_0(\Omega) \subsetneq H^s(\Omega)$. Here we use also the alternative definitions

$$H^s_0(\Omega) := \{u \in H^s(\Omega) \,:\, \gamma_k u = 0 \,,\ 0 \le k < s - 1/2\}$$

where

$$\gamma_k : H^s(\Omega) \to H^{s-k-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)\,, \quad s > k + 1/2\,,$$

is defined as the unique continuous and surjective linear maps such that

$$\gamma_k u\,(x) = \frac{\partial^k u}{\partial \nu_a^k}\,(x)\,, \qquad u \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)\,, \quad x \in \Gamma\,.$$

Here $\frac{\partial^k}{\partial \nu_a^k}$ denotes the k-th order directional derivative along the vector $\nu_a := a\nu$, where ν is the inward normal vector on Γ.

The vector spaces $H^s(\Gamma)$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, are the Sobolev-Hilbert spaces, defined, since Γ can be made a smooth compact Riemannian manifold, as the completion of $C^\infty(\Gamma)$ with respect of the scalar product

$$\langle h_1, h_2\rangle_{H^s(\Gamma)} := \langle h_1, (-\Delta_{LB} + 1)^s h_2\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}\,.$$

Here the self-adjoint operator Δ_{LB} is the Laplace-Beltrami operator in $L^2(\Gamma)$. With such a definition $(-\Delta_{LB} + 1)^s$ can be extended to a unitary map, which we denote by the same symbol,

$$(-\Delta_{LB} + 1)^s : H^r(\Gamma) \to H^{r-2s}(\Gamma)\,.$$

For successive notational convenience we pose

$$\Lambda := (-\Delta_{LB} + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}} : H^s(\Gamma) \to H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)\,, \quad \Sigma := \Lambda^{-1}$$

and we denote by $(\cdot,\cdot)_{-s,s}$ the duality between $H^{-s}(\Gamma)$ and $H^s(\Gamma)$, i.e

$$(h_1, h_2)_{-s,s} = \langle \Sigma^{2s} h_1, \Lambda^{2s} h_2\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}\,.$$

Warning. Notice that in [37] and [38] Λ has been defined as $(-\Delta_{LB} + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Such a change in notation is due to a different choice of the space $\mathfrak{h}$: $L^2(\Gamma)$ instead of $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$.

Remark 4.1. In the following we use also the equivalent Besov-type norm on $H^s(\Gamma)$, $0 < s < 1$, defined by

$$\|h\|^2_{H^s(\Gamma)} = \|h\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \int_{\Gamma\times\Gamma} \frac{|h(x) - h(y)|^2}{\|x - y\|^{n+2s-1}}\, d\sigma(x) d\sigma(y)\,,$$

where σ denotes surface measure. By $|\,|a| - |b|\,| \le |a - b|$, one immediately gets $\|\,|h|\,\|_{H^s(\Gamma)} \le \|h\|_{H^s(\Gamma)}$. By such an inequality, $H^s(\Gamma)$ is a Dirichlet space for any $0 < s < 1$. By $\|\,|h|\,\|_{H^1(\Gamma)} = \|h\|_{H^1(\Gamma)}$, also $H^1(\Gamma)$ is a Dirichlet space.

The symmetric operator $S = A_{\min}$,

$$A_{\min} : C_c^\infty(\Omega) \subseteq L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega)\,, \quad A_{\min} u := \nabla\!\cdot\! a\nabla u\,,$$

is positive and its Friedrichs' extensions A_D (here the index D stands for Dirichlet boundary conditions) is given by

$$A_D : H^2(\Omega)\cap H^1_0(\Omega)\subseteq L^2(\Omega)\to L^2(\Omega)\,,\qquad A_D u=\nabla\cdot a\nabla u$$

with corresponding bilinear form

$$F_D : H^1_0(\Omega)\times H^1_0(\Omega)\subseteq L^2(\Omega)\times L^2(\Omega)\to\mathbb{R}\,,$$

$$F_D(u,v):=\langle\nabla u,a\nabla v\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}\equiv\sum_{1\le i,j\le n}\int_\Omega a_{ij}\,\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\,\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j}\,dx\,.$$

A_D has a compact resolvent and its spectrum consists of an infinite sequence of negative eigenvalues, each having finite multiplicity.

The closure of $A_{\min}$ is given by

$$A^{**}_{\min} : H^2_0(\Omega)\subseteq L^2(\Omega)\to L^2(\Omega)\,,\qquad A^{**}_{\min}u=\nabla\cdot a\nabla u\,,$$

and in order to find all self-adjoint extensions of $A_{\min}$ we can apply Theorems 2.1 and 2.4 with

$$A_0=A_D\,,\quad F_0=F_D\,,\quad \mathfrak{h}=L^2(\Gamma)\,,\quad \tau=\Lambda\gamma_1|(H^2(\Omega)\cap H^1_0(\Omega))\,.$$

Notice that $\mathscr{K}(\tau)=H^2_0(\Omega)$ and that τ is surjective by the surjectivity of

$$\gamma : H^2(\Omega)\to H^{\frac32}(\Gamma)\times H^{\frac12}(\Gamma)\,,\quad \gamma u:=(\gamma_0 u,\gamma_1 u)\,.$$

In order to write down the extensions of $A_{\min}$ together with their resolvents, we make explicit the operator G_0. One has $A^*_{\min}=A_{\max}$, where $A_{\max}$, the maximal realization of $\nabla\cdot a\nabla$, is defined by

$$A_{\max} : \mathscr{D}(A_{\max})\subseteq L^2(\Omega)\to L^2(\Omega)\,,\qquad A_{\max}u:=\nabla\cdot a\nabla u\,,$$

$$\mathscr{D}(A_{\max}):=\{u\in L^2(\Omega)\,:\,\nabla\cdot a\nabla u\in L^2(\Omega)\}\,.$$

The maps γ_0 and γ_1 can be extended to (see [29], Chapter 2, Section 6.5)

$$\hat\gamma_0 : \mathscr{D}(A_{\max})\to H^{-\frac12}(\Gamma)\,,$$

$$\hat\gamma_1 : \mathscr{D}(A_{\max})\to H^{-\frac32}(\Gamma)\,,$$

and Green's formula can be extended to the case in which $u\in\mathscr{D}(A_{\max})$, $v\in H^2(\Omega)\cap H^1_0(\Omega)$:

$$\langle A_{\max}u,v\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}=\langle u,A_D v\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}+(\hat\gamma_0 u,\gamma_1 v)_{-\frac12,\frac12}\,. \tag{4.1}$$

Moreover for any $u\in\mathscr{D}(A_{\max})\cap H^1(\Omega)$ one has $\hat\gamma_1 u\in H^{-\frac12}(\Gamma)$ and then for any $v\in H^1(\Omega)$ the "half" Green's formula holds (see e.g. [32], Theorem 4.4):

$$\langle -A_{\max}u,v\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}=\langle\nabla u,a\nabla v\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}+(\hat\gamma_1 u,\gamma_0 v)_{-\frac12,\frac12}\,. \tag{4.2}$$

By Remark 2.3, since $A_{\max} = A^*_{\min}$, we have $A_{\max}G_0h = 0$ and so by (4.1) there follows, for all $h \in L^2(\Gamma)$ and for all $u \in \mathscr{D}(A_D)$,

$$\langle G_0h, A_Du\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} = -(\hat\gamma_0 G_0h, \gamma_1 u)_{-\frac12,\frac12}\,.$$

Since, by (2.7),

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle G_0h, A_Du\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} = \langle G_0h, A_{\max}u\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}\\ =&\langle G_0h, A^*_{\min}u\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} = -\langle h, \Lambda\gamma_1 u\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}\,,\end{aligned}$$

one obtains $\hat\gamma_0 G_0 h = \Lambda h$. Thus G_0h is the unique solution of the Dirichlet boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} A_{\max}G_0h = 0\,,\\ \hat\gamma_0\, G_0h = \Lambda h\,,\end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

i.e.

$$G_0\Sigma = K_0\,,$$

where

$$K_\lambda : H^{-\frac12}(\Gamma) \to \mathscr{D}(A_{\max})\,, \qquad \lambda \ge 0\,,$$

denotes the Poisson operator which provides the unique solution of the Dirichlet problem with boundary data in $H^{-\frac12}(\Gamma)$ (see [29], Chapter 2, Section 6):

$$\begin{cases} A_{\max}K_\lambda h = \lambda K_\lambda h\,,\\ \hat\gamma_0\, K_\lambda h = h\,.\end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

Posing

$$R^D_\lambda := (-A_D + \lambda)^{-1}\,,$$

by (2.5) and by

$$K_\lambda = K_0 - \lambda R^D_\lambda K_0\,, \tag{4.5}$$

one has

$$G_\lambda\Sigma = K_\lambda\,.$$

Remark 4.2. By elliptic regularity (see e.g. [21], Proposition III 5.2), K_λ is a topological isomorphism from $H^s(\Gamma)$ onto $H^{s+\frac12}(\Omega)$ for any $s \ge -\frac12$, so that, for all $s \ge 0$,

$$G_\lambda h \in H^s(\Omega) \iff h \in H^s(\Gamma)\,.$$

Since $\mathscr{R}(G_0) = \mathscr{K}(A^*_{\min}) = \mathscr{K}(A_{\max})$, $G_0h \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ implies $G_0h \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H^1_0(\Omega) = \mathscr{D}(A_D)$. However by (4.3) this implies $h = 0$. Thus (2.11) always holds true in this case and we can apply Theorem 2.4 to $S = A_{\min}$.

By $\Sigma\hat{\gamma}_0\, G_0 h = h$, for any $(\Pi,\Theta)\in\mathsf{E}(L^2(\Gamma))$ one has (this is our version of Theorem 2.2 in [22])

Theorem 4.3. *Let* $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}\in\mathsf{Ext}(A_{\min})$ *and let* $F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ *the symmetric bilinear form associated with* $-A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$. *Then*

$$F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}:\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})\times\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})\subseteq L^2(\Omega)\times L^2(\Omega)\to\mathbb{R}\,,$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})\\ =&\{u\in L^2(\Omega):u=u_0+K_0\tilde{\gamma}_0 u\,,\ u_0\in H^1_0(\Omega)\,,\ \tilde{\gamma}_0 u\in\Lambda\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta})\}\,,\end{aligned}$$

$$F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}(u,v)=F_D(u_0,v_0)+f_{\Pi,\Theta}(\Sigma\tilde{\gamma}_0 u,\Sigma\tilde{\gamma}_0 v)\,,$$

where

$$\tilde{\gamma}_0:H^1_0(\Omega)+\mathscr{R}(K_0)\to H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)\,,$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_0 u\equiv\tilde{\gamma}_0(u_0+K_0h):=\gamma_0u_0+\hat{\gamma}_0K_0h=h\,.$$

Remark 4.4. Notice that, for any $s\in(0,1]$,

$$\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})\subseteq H^s(\Omega)\quad\iff\quad\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta})\subseteq H^s(\Gamma)\,.$$

Indeed, since $u=u_0+G_0h$ with $u_0\in H^1_0(\Omega)$ and $h\in\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta})$, one has that $u\in H^s(\Omega)$ if and only if $G_0h\in H^s(\Omega)$. By Remark 4.2 $G_0h\in H^s(\Omega)$ if and only if $h\in H^s(\Gamma)$.

By Theorem 4.3 and Remark 4.4 one immediately obtains the following

Corollary 4.5. *If* $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}\in\mathsf{Ext}_0(A_{\min})$ *and if* $\mathscr{D}(F_{\Pi,\Theta})\subseteq H^1(\Omega)$ *then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})=\{u\in H^1(\Omega):\gamma_0u\in\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma})\}\\ =&\{u\in L^2(\Omega):u=u_0+K_0\gamma_0u\,,\ u_0\in H^1_0(\Omega)\,,\ \gamma_0u\in\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma})\}\,,\end{aligned}$$

$$F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}(u,v)=F_D(u_0,v_0)+f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(\gamma_0u,\gamma_0v)\,.$$

Here Π_Λ *denotes the orthogonal projection onto the* $L^2(\Gamma)$*-closure of* $\Lambda\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta})$ *and* Θ_Σ *is the positive self-adjoint operator in* $\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Lambda)$ *associated with the closed, densely defined, positive symmetric bilinear form*

$$f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}:\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma})\times\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma})\subseteq\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Lambda)\times\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Lambda)\to\mathbb{R}\,,$$

$$\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}):=\Lambda\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta})\,,\qquad f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_1,h_2):=f_{\Pi,\Theta}(\Sigma h_1,\Sigma h_2)$$

Let us now define the bounded linear map

$$\hat{\Pi}_\Lambda:H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)\to H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)\,,\quad\hat{\Pi}_\Lambda:=\Lambda\Pi\Sigma\,.$$

It is immediate to check that $\hat\Pi_\Lambda$ is the orthogonal projector in the Hilbert space $H^{-\frac12}(\Gamma)$ such that $\mathscr{R}(\hat\Pi_\Lambda)=\Lambda\mathscr{R}(\Pi)$. Since $\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Lambda)\subseteq\Lambda\mathscr{R}(\Pi)$, we can define the injection

$$\tilde\Pi_\Lambda:\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Lambda)\to H^{-\frac12}(\Gamma)\,,\quad \tilde\Pi_\Lambda:=\hat\Pi_\Lambda|\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Lambda)\equiv\Lambda\Pi\Sigma|\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Lambda)$$

and, by using the duality $(\cdot,\cdot)_{-\frac12,\frac12}$, its dual

$$\tilde\Pi^\star_\Lambda:H^{\frac12}(\Gamma)\to\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Lambda)$$

By using the same duality we denote by

$$K^\star_\lambda:L^2(\Omega)\to H^{\frac12}(\Gamma)$$

the dual of the linear operator

$$K_\lambda:H^{-\frac12}(\Gamma)\to L^2(\Omega)\,.$$

Notice that, by the definition of G_λ and by the relation $G_\lambda\Sigma=K_\lambda$, one has

$$K^\star_\lambda=\Sigma G^*_\lambda=\gamma_1 R^D_\lambda\,. \tag{4.6}$$

Having introduced these notation, we can state the following result, which provides an alternative Kreĭn's formula (of the kind provided in [7]) for the resolvent of $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ in the case $\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})\subseteq H^1(\Omega)$:

Lemma 4.6. *If* $\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})\subseteq H^1(\Omega)$ *then the resolvent* $R^{(\Pi,\Theta)}_\lambda$ *of* $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ *in* $\mathsf{Ext}_0(A_{\min})$ *is given by*

$$R^{(\Pi,\Theta)}_\lambda=R^D_\lambda+K_\lambda\tilde\Pi_\Lambda(\Theta_\Sigma+\lambda\tilde\Pi^\star_\Lambda K^\star_0K_\lambda\tilde\Pi_\Lambda)^{-1}\tilde\Pi^\star_\Lambda K^\star_\lambda\,.$$

In particular, taking $\Pi=1$*, the resolvent* $R^{(\Theta)}_\lambda$ *of* $A_{(\Theta)}$ *is given by*

$$R^{(\Theta)}_\lambda=R^D_\lambda+K_\lambda(\Theta_\Sigma+\lambda K^\star_0K_\lambda)^{-1}K^\star_\lambda\,.$$

Proof. The thesis is consequence of formula (2.3), of the relation $G_\lambda\Sigma=K_\lambda$ and of the definition of $\hat\Pi_\Lambda$, by noticing that, for any bounded linear operator M such that $0\in\rho(\Theta+M)$, one has

$$(\Theta+M)^{-1}=\Sigma(\Theta_\Sigma+\Sigma M\Sigma)^{-1}\Sigma\,.$$

□

Let us now denote by A_N the self-adjoint extension corresponding to Neumann boundary condition, and by F_N the symmetric bilinear form associated with $-A_N$, i.e.

$$F_N:H^1(\Omega)\times H^1(\Omega)\subseteq L^2(\Omega)\times L^2(\Omega)\to\mathbb{R}\,,$$

$$F_N(u,v):=\langle\nabla u,a\nabla v\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}\,.$$

Decomposing any $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ as $u = u_0 + K_0\gamma_0 u$, $u_0 \in H^1_0(\Omega)$, one gets, by (4.2),

$$F_N(u,v) = F_D(u_0,v_0) - (P_0\gamma_0 u, \gamma_0 v)_{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}\,, \tag{4.7}$$

where P_0 denotes the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator over Γ defined by

$$P_0 : H^s(\Gamma) \to H^{s-1}(\Gamma)\,, \quad s \ge -\frac{1}{2}\,, \quad P_0 := \hat{\gamma}_1\, K_0\,.$$

Notice that (see e.g. [21], Theorem III 1.1)

$$\forall s \ge -\frac{1}{2}\,, \quad P_0 \in \mathsf{B}(H^s(\Gamma), H^{s-1}(\Gamma))\,.$$

Moreover P_0 is $L^2(\Gamma)$-symmetric (by Green's formula) and

$$P_0 : H^1(\Gamma) \subseteq L^2(\Gamma) \to L^2(\Gamma)$$

is a negative self-adjoint operator. By Corollary 4.5 $A_N = A_{(1,\Theta)}$ with

$$\Theta = -\Lambda P_0 \Lambda : H^2(\Gamma) \subseteq L^2(\Gamma) \to L^2(\Gamma)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_1,h_2) &= -f_{P_0}(h_1,h_2) \\ = &- (P_0 h_1, h_2)_{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}} = F_N(K_0 h_1, K_0 h_2) \end{aligned}$$

with $\mathscr{D}(f_{P_0}) = H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$.

Remark 4.7. It is easy to check that both F_D and F_N are Dirichlet forms on $L^2(\Omega)$, see e.g. [16], Examples 1.2.1 and 1.2.3. Both are local and irreducible (see e.g. next Corollary 4.12), F_D is transient since $1 \notin \mathscr{D}(F_D) = H^1_0(\Omega)$ while F_N is recurrent since $1 \in \mathscr{D}(F_N) = H^1(\Omega)$ and $F_N(1) = 0$. Moreover F_D is regular on Ω, while F_N is regular on $\bar{\Omega}$. The corresponding diffusions are, in the case $A_{\min} = \Delta|C^\infty_c(\Omega)$, the absorbing Brownian motion on Ω and the reflecting Brownian motion on $\bar{\Omega}$ respectively (see e.g. Example 3.5.9 in [8]).

By the following result A_N is a fundamental object as regards our purposes (for the proof see [14], Theorem 5.1, [16], Theorem 2.3.1 and [17], Theorem 3.3.1):

Theorem 4.8. *A_N is the maximum element of $\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$.*

Since $A_N = A_{(1,-\Lambda P_0\Lambda)}$, $A_K = A_{(1,0)}$ and $(1,-\Lambda P_0\Lambda) \prec (1,0)$, one has

Corollary 4.9. *The Kreĭn extension A_K of $A_{\min}$ is never Markovian.*

By the definition of logarithmic Sobolev inequality (see Subsection 2.9) as immediate consequence of Theorem 4.8 one has

Corollary 4.10. *If* $A \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ *then* F_A *satisfies a logarithmic Sobolev inequality. Hence the semigroup* e^{tA} *is ultracontractive.*

Proof. By [9], Theorem 3.2.9, for the heat kernel κ_N of A_N one has

$$\kappa_N(t,x,y) \le c\,\left(t^{-\frac{n}{2}} \vee 1\right)\,.$$

Hence, see Subsection 2.9, F_N satisfies a logarithmic Sobolev inequality. Since $A \preceq A_N$, F_A satisfies a logarithmic Sobolev inequality (with the same function) and so e^{tA} is ultracontractive. ☐

Theorem 4.8 also gives Gaussian heat kernel estimates for any Markovian extension (upper Gaussian and lower bounds on κ_D and κ_N can be found in [9] and references therein):

Corollary 4.11. *If* $A \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ *then*

$$\kappa_D \le \kappa_A \le \kappa_N\,,$$

where κ_D *and* κ_N *denote the heat kernels of* A_D *and* A_N *respectively.*

Proof. Here we follow the same kind of reasonings as in [19]. By $A_D \preceq A \preceq A_N$ one gets (see [19], Theorem 2.12) that both $e^{tA} - e^{tA_D}$ and $e^{tA_N} - e^{tA}$ are positivity preserving. By Corollary 4.10 and by (2.18), e^{tA_D}, e^{tA_N} and e^{tA} are trace-class operators and hence they are integral operators. The proof is then concluded by noticing that a positive preserving integral operator has a positive kernel (see [19], Theorem 2.3). ☐

Since $\kappa_D(t,x,y) > 0$ for all $t > 0$ and for all x, y in compact subsets of Ω (see [9], Theorem 3.3.5), by Corollary 4.11 the same is true for κ_A and so one gets the following

Corollary 4.12. *If* $A \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ *then the semigroup* e^{tA} *is irreducible. Hence* A *is either recurrent or transient.*

Remark 4.13. By [39], Theorem 1.1, Theorem 4.8 hold true on arbitrary open bounded set. Since the results we used in Corollaries 4.9-4.12 also hold under more general hypothesis, these results remains true without the smoothness hypothesis on Γ. In particular Corollaries 4.9 and 4.12 remain true in the case of Ω open and bounded while Corollaries 4.10 and 4.11 holds for any open bounded Ω which has the extension property (e.g. Ω has a Lipschitz boundary, in particular Ω is convex). For example, by using the upper Gaussian bound for κ_N given in [9], Theorem 3.2.9, if Ω has the extension property one gets, for any $A \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$, the estimate (here $1 < c_1 < 2$ and the constant $c_\circ$

depends on Ω, c_1 and μ_0)

$$\kappa_A(t,x,y) \le c_\circ \left(\frac{1}{t^{n/2}} \vee 1\right) \exp\left(-\frac{\|x-y\|^2}{4c_1\mu_1 t}\right).$$

Theorem 4.8 suggests us to introduce the set

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{Ext}}(A_{\min}) := \{A \in \mathsf{Ext}(A_{\min}) \,:\, A_D \preceq A \preceq A_N\},$$

so that

$$\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min}) \subseteq \widetilde{\mathsf{Ext}}(A_{\min}) \subseteq \mathsf{Ext}_0(A_{\min}).$$

We also introduce a convenient subset of $\mathsf{E}(L^2(\Gamma))$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{\mathsf{E}}(L^2(\Gamma))\\ :=&\{(\Pi,B) \in \mathsf{E}(L^2(\Gamma)) : \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B}) \cap H^{\frac12}(\Gamma) \text{ is a core of } f_{\Pi,B} \ge 0\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then, for any $(\Pi,B) \in \tilde{\mathsf{E}}(L^2(\Gamma))$, let us define the positive, symmetric, densely defined bilinear form $\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}$ by

$$\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)} : \mathscr{D}(\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}) \times \mathscr{D}(\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}) \subseteq L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R},$$

$$\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}(u,v) := F_N(u,v) + f_{\Pi,B}(\gamma_0 u, \gamma_0 v), \tag{4.8}$$

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}) := \{u \in H^1(\Omega) \,:\, \gamma_0 u \in \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B})\}.$$

Remark 4.14. Notice that

$$\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)} = F_D \iff \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B}) \cap H^{\frac12}(\Gamma) = \{0\}$$

and this, by our hypothesis on the core of $f_{\Pi,B}$, implies $\Pi = 0$. This is consistent with Corollary 4.5 which says that F_D corresponds to $\Pi = 0$. Indeed the core hypothesis was introduced in order to have $\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}$ uniquely defined by $f_{\Pi,B}$ and hence by (Π,B).

One has the following

Theorem 4.15. *1. The symmetric bilinear form $\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}$ is closed and, denoting by $-\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)}$ the self-adjoint operator associated with $\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}$, one has*

$$\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)} \in \widetilde{\mathsf{Ext}}(A_{\min}).$$

2. Let Π_Σ denote the orthogonal projector onto the $L^2(\Gamma)$-closure of $\Sigma\mathscr{R}(\Pi)$. Then

$$f_{\Pi_\Sigma,\Theta_B} : \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Sigma,\Theta_B}) \times \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Sigma,\Theta_B}) \subseteq \mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Sigma) \times \mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Sigma) \to \mathbb{R},$$

$$\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Sigma,\Theta_B}) := \Sigma\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B}) \cap H^1(\Gamma),$$

$$f_{\Pi_\Sigma,\Theta_B}(h_1,h_2) := f_{\Pi,B}(\Lambda h_1, \Lambda h_2) - (P_0\Lambda h_1, \Lambda h_2)_{-\frac12,\frac12}$$

is a symmetric, closed, densely defined, positive bilinear form. Denoting by Θ_B *the positive self-adjoint operator in* $\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Sigma)$ *associated with* f_{Π_Σ,Θ_B} *one has*

$$\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)} = A_{(\Pi_\Sigma,\Theta_B)}\,.$$

3. If $f_{\Pi,B}$ *is a Dirichlet form on* $L^2(\Gamma)$ *then*

$$\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)} \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})\,.$$

Moreover $\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)}$ *is recurrent (equivalently conservative) if and only if*

$$1 \in \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B}) \quad \text{and} \quad f_{\Pi,B}(1) = 0\,.$$

Proof. 1. Since both F_N and $f_{\Pi,B}$ are positive and F_N is closed,

$$\|u_n - u\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}(u_n - u_m) \to 0$$

imply $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $\|u_n - u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \to 0$. Since $\gamma_0 : H^1(\Omega) \to L^2(\Gamma)$ is continuous and $\mathscr{R}(\Pi) \subseteq L^2(\Gamma)$ is closed, one has $\|\gamma_0 u_n - \gamma_0 u\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \to 0$ and $\gamma_0 u \in \mathscr{R}(\Pi)$. Thus, by $f_{\Pi,B}(\gamma_0 u_n - \gamma_0 u_m) \to 0$, since $f_{\Pi,B}$ is closed, one gets $\gamma_0 u \in \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B})$ and $f_{\Pi,B}(\gamma_0 u_n - \gamma_0 u) \to 0$. Thus $\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}$ is closed.

Since, for any $u_0 \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ and for any $v_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$,

$$\langle A_{\min} u_0, v_0\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} = F_D(u_0, v_0) = \tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}(u_0, v_0) = \langle \tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)} u_0, v_0\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}\,,$$

one has $\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)}|C_c^\infty(\Omega) = A_{\min}$ and so $\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)} \in \mathsf{Ext}(A_{\min})$. Since $\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)} \ge 0$, $\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)} \in \mathsf{Ext}_0(A_{\min})$ and so $A_D \preceq \tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)}$. Then $\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)} \preceq A_N$ is consequence of the definition of $\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)}$.
2. By Theorem 4.3 and Remark 4.4, one has

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}) = \{u = u_0 + G_0 h\,,\ u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)\,,\ h \in \Sigma(\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B}) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma))\}\,.$$

Since $\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B}) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ is a core of $f_{\Pi,B}$, $\Sigma(\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B}) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma))$ is dense in $\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Sigma)$. By (4.7),

$$\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}(u,v) = F_D(u_0, v_0) + f_{\Pi_\Sigma,\Theta_B}(\Sigma\gamma_0 u, \Sigma\gamma_0 v)$$

and hence $f_{\Pi_\Sigma,\Theta_B}(h) = \tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}(G_0 h) \ge 0$. Let $\{h_n\}_1^\infty \subset \Sigma(\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B}) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma))$ such that $\|h_n - h\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \to 0$ and $f_{\Pi_\Sigma,\Theta_B}(h_n - h_m) \to 0$. Since $G_0 : L^2(\Gamma) \to L^2(\Omega)$ is continuous and $\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}$ is closed, one has that $G_0 h \in \mathscr{D}(\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)})$, and $\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}(G_0 h_n - G_0 h) \to 0$. Thus f_{Π_Σ,Θ_B} is closed. Finally let us apply Theorem 2.4.
3. By

$$\|\,|u|\,\|_{H^1(\Omega)} = \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\,, \qquad \|\,|h|\,\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)} \le \|h\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)}\,,$$

and

$$a \vee b = \frac{1}{2}\left(a+b+|a-b|\right), \qquad a \wedge b = \frac{1}{2}\left(a+b-|a-b|\right),$$

both $H^1(\Omega)$ and $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ are Dirichlet spaces. Hence, by Theorem 2.9, for any normal contraction Φ the maps $u \mapsto \Phi(u)$ and $h \mapsto \Phi(h)$ are $H^1(\Omega)$- and $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$-continuous respectively. Since $C^\infty(\bar\Omega)$ is dense in $H^1(\Omega)$, and $\gamma_0 : H^1(\Omega) \to H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ is continuous, taking $\{u_n\}_1^\infty \subset C^\infty(\bar\Omega)$ such that $\|u_n - u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \to 0$, one has

$$\gamma_0(\Phi(u)) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \gamma_0(\Phi(u_n)) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi(\gamma_0 u_n) = \Phi(\gamma_0 u)\,. \tag{4.9}$$

Let $f_{\Pi,B}$ be a Dirichlet form. Then, by (4.9),

$$u \in \mathscr{D}(\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \Phi(u) \in \mathscr{D}(\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)})\,,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}(\Phi(u)) =& F_N(\Phi(u)) + f_{\Pi,B}(\Phi(\gamma_0 u))\\ \le& F_N(u) + f_{\Pi,B}(\gamma_0 u)\\ =& \tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}(u)\end{aligned}$$

and so $\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}$ is a Dirichlet form. Finally the result about recurrence is an immediate consequence of (2.21) and the definition of $\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}$. □

To state the next result we introduce the family of Dirichlet-to-Neumann operators

$$P_\lambda : H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma) \to H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)\,, \quad P_\lambda := \hat\gamma_1 K_\lambda\,, \quad \lambda \ge 0\,.$$

By (4.5) one has

$$P_\lambda = P_0 - \lambda K_0^\star K_\lambda\,. \tag{4.10}$$

Then, by Lemma 4.6, one obtains a Kreĭn's formula for the resolvent of $\tilde A_{(\Pi,B)}$:

Lemma 4.16. *Let* $(\Pi, B) \in \tilde{\mathsf{E}}(L^2(\Gamma))$ *and let* $B \dotplus \Pi(-P_\lambda)\Pi$ *be defined as a form-sum by the closed, densely defined positive bilinear form*

$$f_{\Pi,B,\lambda} : (\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B}) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)) \times (\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B}) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)) \subseteq \mathscr{R}(\Pi) \times \mathscr{R}(\Pi) \to \mathbb{R}\,,$$

$$f_{\Pi,B,\lambda}(h_1, h_2) := f_{\Pi,B}(h_1, h_2) - (P_\lambda h_1, h_2)_{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}\,.$$

Then the resolvent $\tilde R_\lambda^{(\Pi,B)}$ *of* $\tilde A_{(\Pi,B)}$ *is given by*

$$\tilde R_\lambda^{(\Pi,B)} = R_\lambda^D + K_\lambda \Pi(B \dotplus \Pi(-P_\lambda)\Pi)^{-1}\Pi K_\lambda^\star\,. \tag{4.11}$$

Proof. By point 2 in Theorem 4.15 we know that $\tilde A_{(\Pi,B)}=A_{(\Pi_\Sigma,\Theta_B)}$. Since $\mathscr{R}((\Pi_\Sigma)_\Lambda)$ is, by definition, the $L^2(\Gamma)$-closure of $\Lambda(\Sigma\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B})\cap H^1(\Gamma))=\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B})\cap H^{\frac12}(\Gamma)$ which, by our hypothesis, is a core, one obtains $(\Pi_\Sigma)_\Lambda=\Pi$. Then $\widehat{(\Pi_\Sigma)}_\Lambda$ is the orthogonal projector onto the $H^{-\frac12}(\Gamma)$-closure of $\mathscr{R}(\Pi)$ and so $\widetilde{(\Pi_\Sigma)}_\Lambda=\Pi|\mathscr{R}(\Pi)$, here considered as map from $\mathscr{R}(\Pi)$ into $H^{-\frac12}(\Gamma)$. Hence $\widetilde{(\Pi_\Sigma)}_\Lambda^{\star}=\Pi|H^{\frac12}(\Gamma)$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.6, noticing that the bilinear form associated with $((\Pi_\Sigma)_\Lambda,(\Theta_B)_\Sigma)$ is given by $f_{\Pi,B,0}$, one gets

$$\tilde R^{(\Pi,B)}_\lambda=R^D_\lambda+K_\lambda\Pi(B\dotplus\Pi(-P_0)\Pi+\lambda\Pi K^\star_0K_\lambda\Pi)^{-1}\Pi K^\star_\lambda\,. \tag{4.12}$$

The proof is then concluded by (4.10). $\square$

Remark 4.17. Given $B\equiv(\mathbf{1},B)\in\tilde{\mathsf{E}}(L^2(\Gamma))$, suppose that f_B is a regular Dirichlet form with Beurling-Deny decomposition

$$f_B=f_B^{(c)}+f_B^{(j)}+f_B^{(k)}\,.$$

Then the Dirichlet form $\tilde F_{(B)}\equiv F_{(1,B)}$ has the decomposition

$$\tilde F_{(B)}=\tilde F^{(c)}_{(B)}+\tilde F^{(j)}_{(B)}+\tilde F^{(k)}_{(B)}\,,$$

where the strongly local component $\tilde F^{(c)}_{(B)}$ is given by

$$\tilde F^{(c)}_{(B)}(u,v)=F_N(u,v)+f_B^{(c)}(\gamma_0u,\gamma_0v)\,,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde F^{(j)}_{(B)}&(u,v)=f_B^{(j)}(\gamma_0u,\gamma_0v)\\ &=\int_{\Gamma\times\Gamma}(\widetilde{\gamma_0u}(x)-\widetilde{\gamma_0u}(y))(\widetilde{\gamma_0v}(x)-\widetilde{\gamma_0v}(y))\,dJ(x,y)\,,\\ \tilde F^{(k)}_{(B)}&(u,v)=f_B^{(k)}(\gamma_0u,\gamma_0v)=\int_\Gamma\widetilde{\gamma_0u}(x)\widetilde{\gamma_0v}(x)\,d\kappa(x)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Hence the Dirichlet form $\tilde F_{(B)}$ is strongly local whenever f_B is strongly local (i.e. $f_B^{(j)}=f_B^{(k)}=0$) and, in the case $\tilde F_{(B)}$ is regular (see next lemma for a criterion), $\mathsf{Z}_{\tilde A_{(B)}}$ is a Diffusion whenever $f_B^{(j)}=0$.

Lemma 4.18. *Let* $B\equiv(\mathbf{1},B)\in\tilde{\mathsf{E}}(L^2(\Gamma))$ *such that either*

$$H^{\frac12}(\Gamma)\subseteq\mathscr{D}(f_B)\quad\text{and}\quad f_B(h)\le c\,\|(-\Delta_{LB})^{\frac14}h\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma)}+c_0\|h\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma)}\,,$$

or

$$\mathscr{D}(f_B)\subseteq H^{\frac12}(\Gamma)\quad\text{and}\quad f_B(h)\ge c\,\|(-\Delta_{LB})^{\frac14}h\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma)}\,,$$

where $c>0$, $c_0\ge0$. *Then*

$$f_B\ \text{regular on}\ \Gamma\quad\Longrightarrow\quad\tilde F_{(B)}\ \text{regular on}\ \bar\Omega.$$

Proof. Let us at first show that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathscr{D}(\tilde F_{(B)})\cap C(\bar\Omega)\\ \equiv&\{u=u_0+K_0h\,,\ u_0\in H^1_0(\Omega)\cap C_0(\Omega)\,,\ h\in\mathscr{D}(f_B)\cap C(\Gamma)\}\end{aligned}$$

is $L^\infty(\Omega)$-dense in $C(\bar\Omega)$. By Stone-Weirerstrass theorem this is equivalent to show that $\mathscr{D}(\tilde F_{(B)})\cap C(\bar\Omega)$ separates the points of $\bar\Omega$ (see [8], Remark 1.3.11). If $x,y\in\Omega$ then one takes $h=0$ and $u_0\in C^\infty_0(\Omega)$ such that $u_0(x)\ne u_0(y)$. If $x,y\in\Gamma$ then, since f_B is regular, there exists $h\in\mathscr{D}(f_B)\cap C(\Gamma)$ such that $h(x)\ne h(y)$ and so $u(x)\ne u(y)$ by posing $u=K_0h$. Suppose now that $x\in\Omega$ and $y\in\Gamma$. Then, given $h\in\mathscr{D}(f_B)\cap C(\Gamma)$, it suffices to take $u=u_0+K_0h$, where $u_0\in C^\infty_0(\Omega)$ is such that $u_0(x)\ne h(y)-K_0h(x)$.

If $H^{\frac12}(\Gamma)\subseteq\mathscr{D}(f_B)$ then $H^{\frac12}(\Gamma)\subseteq\mathscr{D}(f_B)$ and so $\mathscr{D}(\tilde F_{(B)})=H^1(\Omega)$. Taking a sequence $\{u_n\}_1^\infty\subset C^\infty(\bar\Omega)$ converging in $H^1(\Omega)$ to u, since γ_0u_n converges to γ_0u in $H^{\frac12}(\Gamma)$ and

$$(\tilde F_{(B)}+1)(u_n-u)\le(F_N+1)(u_n-u)+(c\vee c_0)\,\|\gamma_0u_n-\gamma_0u\|^2_{H^{\frac12}(\Gamma)}\,,$$

one gets $(\tilde F_{(B)}+1)(u_n-u)\to0$.

Since f_B is regular, for any $h\in\mathscr{D}(f_B)$ there exists a sequence $\{h_n\}_1^\infty\subset\mathscr{D}(f_B)\cap C(\Gamma)$ such that $(f_B+1)(h_n-h)\to0$. If $f_B(h)\ge c\,\|(-\Delta_{LB})^{\frac14}h\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma)}$, then $\|h_n-h\|_{H^{\frac12}(\Gamma)}\to0$ and so K_0h_n converges to K_0h in $H^1(\Omega)$. Given $u=u_0+K_0h\in\mathscr{D}(\tilde F_{(B)})$, let $\{u_{0,n}\}_1^\infty\subset C^\infty_0(\Omega)$ converge in $H^1(\Omega)$ to u_0. Then $u_n=u_{0,n}+K_0h_n\in\mathscr{D}(\tilde F_{(B)})\cap C(\bar\Omega)$, converges in $H^1(\Omega)$ to u and so $(\tilde F_{(B)}+1)(u_n-u)=(F_N+1)(u_n-u)+f_B(h_n-h)\to0$. □

Before stating the converse of Theorem 4.15 we give the following result concerning the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator:

Lemma 4.19. *For all $h\in L^\infty(\Gamma)\cap H^{\frac12}(\Gamma)$ one has*

$$(P_0h,h)_{-\frac12,\frac12}=\lim_{\alpha\uparrow\infty}\alpha\left(\langle K_0h,K_\alpha h\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}-\langle1,K_\alpha h^2\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}\right)\tag{4.13}$$

Proof. By Theorem 2 in [13] (also use Theorem 5.5.9 in [8]),

$$2F_N(K_0h)=\lim_{\alpha\uparrow\infty}\int_{\Gamma\times\Gamma}(h(x)-h(y))^2U_\alpha(x,y)\,d\sigma(x)d\sigma(y)\,,$$

where the kernel U_α is defined by

$$U_\alpha(x,y):=\alpha\int_\Omega\frac{\partial g_\alpha}{\partial\nu_a}(x,z)\,\frac{\partial g_0}{\partial\nu_a}(z,y)\,dz\,,$$

and g_α denotes the kernel of $(-A_D+\alpha)^{-1}$. The proof is then concluded by $F_N(K_0h)=-(P_0h,h)_{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}$, by $K_01=1$ and by

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha\langle K_0h,K_\alpha h\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}=&\int_{\Gamma\times\Gamma}h(x)h(y)U_\alpha(x,y)\,d\sigma(x)d\sigma(y)\\=&\alpha\langle 1,K_\alpha h^2\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}-\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Gamma\times\Gamma}(h(x)-h(y))^2U_\alpha(x,y)\,d\sigma(x)d\sigma(y)\,.\end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 4.15 has the following converse:

Theorem 4.20. *Let* $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}\in\widetilde{\mathsf{Ext}}(A_{\min})$. *Then:*
1.

$$\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})=\{u\in H^1(\Omega)\,:\,\gamma_0u\in\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma})\}\,,$$
$$F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}(u,v)=F_N(u,v)+\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}(\gamma_0u,\gamma_0v)\,,$$

where the positive symmetric bilinear form $\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}$ *is defined by*

$$\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}:\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma})\times\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma})\subseteq\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Lambda)\times\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Lambda)\to\mathbb{R}\,,$$

$$\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}(h_1,h_2):=f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_1,h_2)+(P_0h_1,h_2)_{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}\,.$$

2. If $\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}$ *is closable with closure* f_{Π_Λ,B_Θ} *then* $(\Pi_\Lambda,B_\Theta)\in\tilde{\mathsf{E}}(L^2(\Gamma))$ *and*

$$A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}=\tilde A_{\Pi_\Lambda,B_\Theta}\,,$$

i.e.

$$F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}(u,v)=F_N(u,v)+f_{\Pi_\Lambda,B_\Theta}(\gamma_0u,\gamma_0v)$$

3. If $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}\in\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ *then:*
3.1. $f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}$ *is a Dirichlet form on* $L^2(\Gamma)$*;*
3.2. $\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}$ *is a Markovian form on* $L^2(\Gamma)$*;*
3.3 f_{Π_Λ,B_Θ} *is a Dirichlet form on* $L^2(\Gamma)$ *whenever* $\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}$ *is closable.*
Moreover $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ *is recurrent (equivalently conservative) if and only if*

$$1\in\mathscr{D}(\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda})\quad\textit{and}\quad\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}(1)=0\,.$$

Proof. 1. By Corollary 4.5, by Remark 4.4, and by (4.7), if $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}\in\widetilde{\mathsf{Ext}}(A_{\min})$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})=&\{u\in H^1(\Omega)\,:\,\gamma_0u\in\Lambda\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta})\}\\=&\{u=u_0+K_0h\,,u_0\in H^1_0(\Omega)\,,\;h\in\Lambda\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta})\}\,,\end{aligned}$$

$$F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}(u,v)=F_N(u,v)+\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}(\gamma_0u,\gamma_0v)\,.$$

Even if P is negative, $\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}$ is positive: since $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}\preceq A_N$, one has

$$\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}(h)=F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}(K_0h)-F_N(K_0h)\ge 0\,.$$

2. Since $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)} \preceq A_N$, by Remark 4.4 $\Lambda\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta}) \subseteq H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$. Hence $\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,B_\Theta}) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ contains $\mathscr{D}(f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda})$ and so is a core of f_{Π_Λ,B_Θ}. Thus $(\Pi_\Lambda, B_\Theta) \in \tilde{\mathsf{E}}(L^2(\Gamma))$ and $F_{(\Pi,\Theta)} = \tilde{F}_{(\Pi_\Lambda,B_\Theta)}$.
3.1. By Corollary 4.5, $f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}$ is a closed, positive bilinear form on $\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Lambda)$ such that

$$f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_1,h_2) = F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}(K_0h_1, K_0h_2)$$

for any $h_1, h_2 \in \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma})$. For any $\alpha \geq 0$, let us define the closed, positive bilinear form on $\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\Lambda)$ with domain $\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma})$

$$f^{(\alpha)}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_1,h_2) := f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_1,h_2) + \langle M_\alpha \Sigma h_1, \Sigma h_2\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}\,. \tag{4.14}$$

By Remark 2.5

$$f^{(\alpha)}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h) = \big(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)} + \alpha\big)\,(K_\alpha h)\,, \qquad K_\alpha := G_\alpha \Sigma\,.$$

Given $h \in \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma})$, suppose that $\tilde\Phi(h) \notin \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma})$ for some normal contraction $\tilde\Phi$. By (4.9) $\gamma_0\tilde\Phi(K_0h) = \tilde\Phi(\gamma_0K_0h) = \tilde\Phi(h)$ and so, by Corollary 4.5, $\tilde\Phi(K_0h) \notin \mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})$ which is impossible since $K_0h \in \mathscr{D}(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)})$ and $F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ is a Dirichlet form by hypothesis. Thus for any normal contraction Φ one has

$$h \in \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}) \quad\Longrightarrow\quad \Phi(h) \in \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma})\,.$$

Moreover, since $F_{(\Pi,\Theta)} + \alpha$ is a Dirichlet form and $u_\alpha := \Phi(K_\alpha h) - K_\alpha\Phi(h) \in H^1_0(\Omega)$, by Corollary 4.5 and Remark 2.5 one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
&f^{(\alpha)}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(\Phi(h)) \leq (F_D + \alpha)\,(u_\alpha) + f^{(\alpha)}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(\Phi(h))\\
=&\big(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)} + \alpha\big)\,(\Phi(K_\alpha h)) \leq \big(F_{(\Pi,\Theta)} + \alpha\big)\,(K_\alpha h)\\
=&f^{(\alpha)}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $f^{(\alpha)}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}$ is a Dirichlet form for any $\alpha \geq 0$.
3.2. Denoting by $f^{\lambda}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}$ and $f^{(\alpha),\lambda}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}$ the Yosida approximations of $f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}$ and $f^{(\alpha)}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}$ respectively, and posing $h_n := ((-n) \vee h) \wedge n$, by Theorem 2.11, by (4.14) and by Lemma 4.13 one has (here we follow

the same strategy as in the proof of point (i) in [14], Lemma 5.4)

$$\begin{aligned}
&f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h)\\
&=\lim_{n\uparrow\infty}\lim_{\alpha\uparrow\infty}\lim_{\lambda\uparrow\infty}\left(\breve f^{(\alpha),\lambda}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_n)+\check f^{(\alpha),\lambda}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_n)-\langle M_\alpha\Sigma h_n,\Sigma h_n\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}\right)\\
&=\lim_{n\uparrow\infty}\lim_{\alpha\uparrow\infty}\lim_{\lambda\uparrow\infty}\left(\breve f^{(\alpha),\lambda}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_n)+\check f^{\lambda}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_n)\right)\\
&+\lim_{n\uparrow\infty}\lim_{\alpha\uparrow\infty}\left(\langle M_\alpha\Sigma 1,\Sigma h_n^2\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}-\langle M_\alpha\Sigma h_n,\Sigma h_n\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}\right)\\
&=\lim_{n\uparrow\infty}\lim_{\alpha\uparrow\infty}\lim_{\lambda\uparrow\infty}\left(\breve f^{(\alpha),\lambda}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_n)+\check f^{\lambda}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_n)\right)\\
&+\lim_{n\uparrow\infty}\lim_{\alpha\uparrow\infty}\left(\langle 1,K_\alpha h_n^2\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}-\langle K_0h_n,K_\alpha h_n\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}\right)\\
&=\lim_{n\uparrow\infty}\lim_{\alpha\uparrow\infty}\lim_{\lambda\uparrow\infty}\left(\breve f^{(\alpha),\lambda}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_n)+\check f^{\lambda}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_n)\right)-(P_0h,h)_{-\frac12,\frac12}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}(h)=\lim_{n\uparrow\infty}\lim_{\alpha\uparrow\infty}\lim_{\lambda\uparrow\infty}\left(\breve f^{(\alpha),\lambda}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_n)+\check f^{\lambda}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_n)\right)$$

and so $\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}$ is a Markovian form since both $\breve f^{(\alpha),\lambda}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}$ and $\check f^{\lambda}_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}$ are Markovian forms.
3.3. If $\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}$ is closable then f_{Π_Λ,B_Θ} is a Dirichlet form by Theorem 2.7.

The result on recurrence is an immediate consequence of (2.21). □

Corollary 4.21. *$\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}$ in (4.8) is a Dirichlet form in $L^2(\Omega)$ if and only if $f_{\Pi,B}$ is a Dirichlet form in $L^2(\Gamma)$. Equivalently $\tilde R^{(\Pi,B)}_\lambda$ in (4.11) is a Markovian resolvent in $L^2(\Omega)$, i.e. is the resolvent of a Markovian self-adjoint extension of $A_{\min}$, if and only if $f_{\Pi,B}$ is a Dirichlet form in $L^2(\Gamma)$.*

By combining Theorem 4.15 with Theorem 4.20 one gets the analogue of Theorem 3.15:

Theorem 4.22. *Let $A\in\mathsf{Ext}(A_{\min})$. Then A belongs to $\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ if and only if $\mathscr{D}(F_A)\subseteq H^1(\Omega)$ and the bilinear form*

$$f_{[A]}:(\gamma_0\mathscr{D}(F_A))\times(\gamma_0\mathscr{D}(F_A))\subseteq L^2(\Gamma)\times L^2(\Gamma)\to\mathbb{R}\,,$$

$$f_{[A]}(h_1,h_2):=F_A(K_0h_1,K_0h_2)$$

is a Dirichlet form which admits the decomposition

$$f_{[A]}(h_1,h_2)=f_b(h_1,h_2)-(P_0h_1,h_2)_{-\frac12,\frac12}\,,$$

where

$$f_b:(\gamma_0\mathscr{D}(F_A))\times(\gamma_0\mathscr{D}(F_A))\subseteq L^2(\Gamma)\times L^2(\Gamma)\to\mathbb{R}$$

is a Markovian form. A is recurrent (equivalently conservative) if and only if

$$1\in\gamma_0\mathscr{D}(F_A)\quad\textit{and}\quad f_b(1)\equiv f_{[A]}(1)=0\,.$$

Proof. By Theorem 2.1, we know that $A=A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ for some (Π,Θ) belonging to $\mathsf{E}(L^2(\Gamma))$.

If $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}\in\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ then $\mathscr{D}(F_A)\subseteq H^1(\Omega)$ by Theorem 4.8 and then $f_{[A]}(h_1,h_2)=f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_1,h_2)$ by Corollary 4.5. The thesis is then a consequence of Theorem 4.20 by posing $f_b=\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}$.

Conversely, if $\mathscr{D}(F_A)\subseteq H^1(\Omega)$ then, by Corollary 4.5, one gets $f_{[A]}(h_1,h_2)=f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(h_1,h_2)$ and, proceeding as in the proof of point 1 of Theorem 4.20, by $\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta})\subseteq H^1(\Gamma)$, by Corollary 4.5, by Remark 4.4, and by (4.7) one obtains

$$F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}(u,v)=F_N(u,v)+\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}(\gamma_0u,\gamma_0v)\,.$$

By posing again $f_b=\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}$ and supposing f_b is Markovian, one gets, as in the proof of point 3 in Theorem 4.15,

$$\begin{aligned}F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}(\Phi(u))=&F_N(\Phi(u))+f_b(\Phi(\gamma_0u))\\ \le&F_N(u)+f_b(\gamma_0u)\\ =&F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}(u)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ is a Dirichlet form and $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}\in\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$. □

Since in the proof of Theorem 4.15 the hypothesis requiring $f_{\Pi,B}$ closed was used there only to show that $\tilde F_{(\Pi,B)}$ is closed, Theorem 4.22 can be re-phrased in the following form:

Theorem 4.23. *Let F be a closed bilinear form on $L^2(\Omega)$. Then $F=F_A$ with $A\in\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ if and only if $\mathscr{D}(F)\subseteq H^1(\Omega)$ and there exists a Markovian form*

$$f_b:\mathscr{D}(f_b)\times\mathscr{D}(f_b)\subseteq L^2(\Gamma)\times L^2(\Gamma)\to\mathbb{R}$$

such that

$$\mathscr{D}(F)=\{u\in H^1(\Omega):\gamma_0u\in\mathscr{D}(f_b)\}$$

and

$$F(u,v)=F_N(u,v)+f_b(\gamma_0u,\gamma_0u)\,.$$

A is recurrent (equivalently conservative) if and only if

$$1\in\mathscr{D}(f_b)\quad\textit{and}\quad f_b(1)=0\,.$$

Next we give an equivalent version of Theorem 4.22 in terms of resolvents.

A family $R_\lambda \in \mathsf{B}(L^2(\Omega))$, $\lambda > 0$, of bounded symmetric linear operators is said to be a *resolvent family* in $L^2(\Omega)$ if it satisfies the resolvent identity

$$R_\lambda - R_\mu = (\mu - \lambda) R_\lambda R_\mu$$

and the bounds

$$\|R_\lambda u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \frac{1}{\lambda}\, \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\,.$$

Lemma 4.24. *If R_λ, $\lambda > 0$, is a resolvent family, then the bilinear form*

$$\mathscr{D}(f_{[R]}) := \{h \in L^2(\Gamma) : \lim_{\lambda\uparrow\infty} \langle G_0 h, \lambda(1 - \lambda R_\lambda) G_0 h\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} < \infty\}\,,$$

$$f_{[R]}(h_1, h_2) := \lim_{\lambda\uparrow\infty} \langle G_0 h_1, \lambda(1 - \lambda R_\lambda) G_0 h_2\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}\,,$$

is symmetric, positive and closed.

Proof. By [17], Theorem 1.3.2, $\lambda \mapsto \langle u, \lambda(1 - \lambda R_\lambda) u\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}$ is not decreasing and the bilinear form

$$\mathscr{D}(F_{[R]}) := \{u \in L^2(\Omega) : \lim_{\lambda\uparrow\infty} \langle u, \lambda(1 - \lambda R_\lambda) u\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} < \infty\}\,,$$

$$F_{[R]}(u, v) := \lim_{\lambda\uparrow\infty} \langle u, \lambda(1 - \lambda R_\lambda) v\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}\,,$$

is positive, symmetric and closed. Hence

$$\mathscr{D}(f_{[R]}) = \{h \in L^2(\Gamma) : G_0 h \in \mathscr{D}(F_{[R]})\}$$

and

$$f_{[R]}(h_1, h_2) = F_{[R]}(G_0 h_1, G_0 h_2)\,.$$

The thesis then follows by $G_0 \in \mathsf{B}(L^2(\Omega), L^2(\Gamma))$. □

Theorem 4.25. *The resolvent family $R_\lambda \in \mathsf{B}(L^2(\Omega))$, $\lambda > 0$, is the resolvent of $A \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\rm M}(A_{\min})$ if and only if the following conditions hold:*
1. $\mathscr{D}(f_{[R]}) \subseteq H^1(\Gamma)$ and the bilinear form

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde f_{[R]}) := \Lambda \mathscr{D}(f_{[R]})\,, \quad \tilde f_{[R]}(h_1, h_2) := f_{[R]}(\Sigma h_1, \Sigma h_2)$$

is a Dirichlet form in $L^2(\Gamma)$ which admits the decomposition

$$\tilde f_{[R]}(h_1, h_2) = f_b(h_1, h_2) - (P_0 h_1, h_2)_{-\frac12, \frac12}\,,$$

where f_b, $\mathscr{D}(f_b) \equiv \mathscr{D}(\tilde f_{[R]})$, is a Markovian form in $L^2(\Gamma)$;
2. R_λ admits the decomposition

$$R_\lambda = R^D_\lambda + G_\lambda \Pi_{[R]} (\Theta_{[R]} + \lambda \Pi_{[R]} G_0^* G_\lambda \Pi_{[R]})^{-1} \Pi_{[R]} G_\lambda^*\,, \tag{4.15}$$

where $\Pi_{[R]}$ denotes the orthogonal projector onto the $L^2(\Gamma)$-closure of $\mathscr{D}(f_{[R]})$ and $\Theta_{[R]}$ denotes the positive self-adjoint operator in $\mathscr{R}(\Pi_{[R]})$ associated to $f_{[R]}$.

Proof. Suppose that $R_\lambda = R^A_\lambda$ with $A \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$. Then, by Theorem 2.1, Theorem 4.8 and Remark 4.4, $A = A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ for some $(\Pi, \Theta) \in \mathsf{E}(L^2(\Gamma))$ with $\mathscr{D}(f_{(\Pi,\Theta)}) \subseteq H^1(\Gamma)$. Then, by Theorem 2.4 and Theorem 2.11, $f_{[R]} = f_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$. By (2.3), $R_\lambda = R^{(\Pi,\Theta)}_\lambda$ and (4.15) holds with $\Theta_{[R]} = \Theta$ and $\Pi_{[R]} = \Pi$. By Corollary 4.5, $\tilde f_{[R]} = f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}$ and the decomposition $\tilde f_{[R]}(h_1, h_2) = f_b(h_1, h_2) - (P_0h_1, h_2)_{-\frac12,\frac12}$ follows by Theorem 4.20.

Conversely suppose that 1 and 2 hold true. Then by (4.15) and by Theorem 2.1, R_λ is the resolvent of $A_{(\Pi_{[R]},\Theta_{[R]})} \in \mathsf{Ext}(A_{\min})$. By $\mathscr{D}(f_{[R]}) \subseteq H^1(\Gamma)$, by Remark 4.4 and by Corollary 4.5, one obtains

$$F_{(\Pi_{[R]},\Theta_{[R]})}(u, v) = F_D(u_0, v_0) + \tilde f_{[R]}(\gamma_0u, \gamma_0v)\,.$$

Thus

$$F_{(\Pi_{[R]},\Theta_{[R]})}(u, v) = F_N(u, v) + f_b(\gamma_0u, \gamma_0v)$$

and so $A_{(\Pi_{[R]},\Theta_{[R]})} \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ by Theorem 4.23. □

Remark 4.26. Suppose that $R_\lambda = R^A_\lambda$ with $A \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$. Then, by Lemma 4.6, (4.15) can be rewritten as

$$R_\lambda = R^D_\lambda + K_\lambda\tilde\Pi_\Lambda(\tilde\Theta_{[R]} + \lambda\tilde\Pi_\Lambda K^\star_0K^\star_\lambda\tilde\Pi_\Lambda)^{-1}\tilde\Pi_\Lambda K^\star_\lambda\,,$$

where $\tilde\Theta_{[R]}$ is the Markovian operator associated with the Dirichlet form $\tilde f_{[R]}$. This resolvent formula is our version of Fukushima's (1.1).

Remark 4.27. By Corollary 4.21, in order to get the analogue of Theorem 3.9 one should prove that if $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)} \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$ then $\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}$ is always closable. In this case

$$\mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min}) = \{\tilde A_{(\Pi,B)} \,:\, (\Pi, B) \in \tilde{\mathsf{E}}(L^2(\Gamma)\,,\ f_{\Pi,B} \text{ is a Dirichlet form}\}\,.$$

Equivalently in Theorem 4.23 one could avoid the hypothesis "F closed" and substitute "f_b Markovian form" with "f_b Dirichlet form". However proving that $\tilde f^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}$ is closable is a not trivial problem since Θ is positive and always unbounded (by $\mathscr{D}(\Theta) \subseteq H^1(\Gamma)$) while P_0 is negative and unbounded.

5. Wentzell-type boundary conditions

In order to describe the self-adjoint extension of $A_{\min}$ corresponding to the bilinear form $F_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ we introduce the extended trace operators $\hat\rho$ and $\hat\tau$ as in Remark 2.3. By $\hat\gamma_0\, G_0h = \Lambda h$ and by Remark 2.3 one has

$$\hat\rho : \mathscr{D}(A_{\max}) \to L^2(\Gamma)\,, \quad \hat\rho u := \Sigma\hat\gamma_0 u$$

and

$$\hat\tau : \mathscr{D}(A_{\max}) \to L^2(\Gamma)\,,$$

$$\hat{\tau}u := \tau(u - G_0\Sigma\hat{\gamma}_0 u) \equiv \Lambda(\hat{\gamma}_1 u - P_0\hat{\gamma}_0 u)\,. \tag{5.1}$$

Notice that even if both $\hat{\gamma}_1 u$ and $P_0\hat{\gamma}_0 u$ are in $H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$, by (5.1) one gets

$$(\hat{\gamma}_1 u - P_0\hat{\gamma}_0 u) \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)\,.$$

Then, by (2.9), one has the following (this is our version of Theorem 4.1 in [21], Chapter III)

Theorem 5.1. $\mathsf{Ext}(A_{\min}) = \{A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}\,,\ (\Pi,\Theta) \in \mathsf{E}(L^2(\Gamma))\}$, *where*

$$A_{(\Pi,\Theta)} : \mathscr{D}(A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}) \subseteq L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega)\,, \quad A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}u = A_{\max}u\,,$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathscr{D}(A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}) \\ =&\{u \in \mathscr{D}(A_{\max}) \,:\, \Sigma\hat{\gamma}_0 u \in \mathscr{D}(\Theta)\,,\ \Pi\Lambda(\hat{\gamma}_1 u - P_0\hat{\gamma}_0 u) = \Theta\Sigma\hat{\gamma}_0 u\}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.2. Notice that, for all $s \in (0,2]$

$$\mathscr{D}(A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}) \subseteq H^s(\Omega) \quad\iff\quad \mathscr{D}(\Theta) \subseteq H^s(\Gamma)\,.$$

Indeed, since $u = u_0 + G_0 h$ with $u_0 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H^1_0(\Omega)$ and $h \in \mathscr{D}(\Theta)$, one has that $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ if and only if $G_0 h \in H^s(\Omega)$. By Remark 4.2 $G_0 h \in H^s(\Omega)$ if and only if $h \in H^s(\Gamma)$.

In the case $A \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$, the boundary conditions characterizing its domain are said *Wentzell-type boundary conditions.* Such boundary conditions can be expressed by the boundary form f_b appearing in Theorem 4.22:

Theorem 5.3. *Let $A \in \widetilde{\mathsf{Ext}}(A_{\min})$. Then $u \in \mathscr{D}(A)$ if and only if $u \in \mathscr{D}(A_{\max}) \cap H^1(\Omega)$, $\gamma_0 u \in \mathscr{D}(f_b)$ and*

$$\forall h \in \mathscr{D}(f_b)\,, \quad f_b(\gamma_0 u, h) = (\hat{\gamma}_1 u, h)_{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}\,. \tag{5.2}$$

The boundary conditions (5.2) *define a Markovian extension of $A_{\min}$, i.e. they are of Wentzell-type, if and only if f_b is a Markovian form on $L^2(\Gamma)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.1, $A = A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}$ for some $(\Pi,\Theta) \in \mathsf{E}(L^2(\Gamma))$.

If $A_{(\Pi,\Theta)} \in \widetilde{\mathsf{Ext}}(A_{\min})$ then $\mathscr{D}(A_{(\Pi,\Theta)}) \subseteq H^1(\Omega)$ and so $(\gamma_0 u, \hat{\gamma}_1 u) \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma) \times H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ for any $u \in \mathscr{D}(A_{(\Pi,\Theta)})$.

By Theorem 5.1, for all $u \in \mathscr{D}(A_{(\Pi,\Theta)})$ and for all $h \in \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}) \equiv \mathscr{D}(f_b)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle(\hat{\gamma}_1 u - P_0\gamma_0 u), h\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} &= (\hat{\gamma}_1 u, h)_{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}} - (P_0\gamma_0 u, h)_{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}} \\ = \langle\Theta\Sigma\gamma_0 u, \Sigma h\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} &= f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(\gamma_0 u, h)\,. \end{aligned}$$

Relations (5.2) are then consequence of the definition of $f_b \equiv \tilde{f}^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}$ (see Theorem 4.20).

Conversely, if (5.2) hold true, by $f_b \equiv \tilde{f}^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}$ and the definition of $\tilde{f}^{\Theta}_{\Pi_\Lambda}$ in Theorem 4.20, for all $h \in \Sigma\mathscr{D}(f_b) = \Sigma\mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}) = \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,\Theta})$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\Pi,\Theta}(\Sigma\gamma_0 u, h) =& f_{\Pi_\Lambda,\Theta_\Sigma}(\gamma_0 u, \Lambda h) = \langle(\hat{\gamma}_1 u - P_0\gamma_0 u), \Lambda h\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ =& \langle\Lambda(\hat{\gamma}_1 u - P_0\gamma_0 u), h\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} \,. \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\Sigma\gamma_0 u \in \mathscr{D}(\Theta)\,, \quad \Pi\Lambda(\hat{\gamma}_1 u - P_0\gamma_0 u) = \Theta\Sigma\gamma_0 u\,.$$

Finally, by Theorem 4.22, $A \in \mathsf{Ext}_{\mathrm{M}}(A_{\min})$, i.e. the boundary conditions are Wenzell-type, if and only if f_b is Markovian. □

Corollary 5.4. *Let* $(\Pi, B) \in \tilde{\mathsf{E}}(L^2(\Gamma))$. *Then* $u \in D(\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)})$ *if and only if* $u \in \mathscr{D}(A_{\max}) \cap H^1(\Omega)$, $\gamma_0 u \in \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B})$ *and*

$$\forall h \in \mathscr{D}(f_{\Pi,B}) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)\,, \quad f_{\Pi,B}(\gamma_0 u, h) = (\hat{\gamma}_1 u, h)_{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}\,. \tag{5.3}$$

The boundary conditions (5.3) *define a Markovian extensions of* $A_{\min}$*, i.e they are of Wentzell-type, if and only if* $f_{\Pi,B}$ *is a Dirichlet form on* $L^2(\Gamma)$*.*

Remark 5.5. By Beurling-Deny decomposition, if f_B, $B \equiv (1, B) \in \tilde{\mathsf{E}}(L^2(\Gamma))$, is a regular Dirichlet form then the corresponding Wentzell-type boundary conditions are

$$\begin{aligned} & f^{(c)}_B(\gamma_0 u, h) + \int_{\Gamma\times\Gamma} (\widetilde{\gamma_0 u}(x) - \widetilde{\gamma_0 u}(y))(\tilde{h}(x) - \tilde{h}(y))\, dJ(x,y) \\ & + \int_\Gamma \widetilde{\gamma_0 u}(x)\tilde{h}(x)\, d\kappa(x) = (\hat{\gamma}_1 u, h)_{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}\,. \end{aligned}$$

These boundary conditions are similar (in weak form) to the ones appearing in Wentzell's seminal paper [48].

Remark 5.6. In the case $\Pi = 1$ and B is such that the form sum appearing in Lemma 4.16 can be improved to an operator sum (this holds under the hypotheses given in the successive Remark 5.7, see [37], Example 5.5, [21], Chapter III, Section 6) then the boundary conditions defining the domain of the extension $\tilde{A}_{(B)} \equiv \tilde{A}_{(1,B)}$ become

$$\hat{\gamma}_1 u = B\gamma_0 u$$

and the resolvent $\tilde{R}^{(B)}_\lambda$ of $A_{(B)}$ is given by the formula (see Lemma 4.16 and (4.6))

$$\tilde{R}^{(B)}_\lambda = (1 + K_\lambda(B - P_\lambda)^{-1}\gamma_1)R^D_\lambda\,.$$

Remark 5.7. Suppose $B \in \mathsf{B}(H^s(\Gamma), H^{s-\alpha}(\Gamma))$ for all $s \ge -\frac{1}{2}$ and for some $\alpha > 0$, and that

$$B : H^\alpha(\Gamma) \subseteq L^2(\Gamma) \to L^2(\Gamma)$$

is self-adjoint and positive. Then $B \equiv (1, B) \in \tilde{\mathsf{E}}(L^2(\Gamma))$ and

$$\mathscr{D}(f_B) = H^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\Gamma)\,, \quad f_B(h_1, h_2) = (Bh_1, h_2)_{-\frac{\alpha}{2},\frac{\alpha}{2}}\,.$$

Thus, by Corollary 5.4,

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{A}_{(B)}) = \{u \in \mathscr{D}(A_{\max}) \cap H^1(\Omega) : \gamma_0 u \in H^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\Gamma)\,,\ B\gamma_0 u = \hat{\gamma}_1 u\}\,.$$

If $\alpha < 1$ then, by elliptic regularity, $u \in H^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\Omega)$ and so in this case

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{A}_{(B)}) = \{u \in \mathscr{D}(A_{\max}) \cap H^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\Omega) : B\gamma_0 u = \hat{\gamma}_1 u\}\,.$$

If $\alpha \ge 1$ and supposing

$$\{h \in H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma) \,:\, Bh \in H^s(\Gamma)\} \subseteq H^{s+\alpha}(\Gamma)\,,$$

(this holds if B is an elliptic pseudo-differential operator of order α), then $\gamma_0 u \in H^{-\frac{1}{2}+\alpha}(\Omega)$ and so in this case

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{A}_{(B)}) = \{u \in \mathscr{D}(A_{\max}) \cap H^{2\wedge\alpha}(\Omega) : B\gamma_0 u = \hat{\gamma}_1 u\}\,.$$

In particular, when $\alpha \ge 2$, one has

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{A}_{(B)}) = \{u \in H^2(\Omega) : B\gamma_0 u = \hat{\gamma}_1 u\}\,.$$

By Theorem 4.15, if moreover B is Markovian then $\tilde{A}_{(B)}$ is a Markovian extension of $A_{\min}$ and the boundary conditions $B\gamma_0 u = \hat{\gamma}_1 u$ are of Wentzell-type. The corresponding Dirichlet form $\tilde{F}_{(B)}$ is given by

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{F}_{(B)}) = H^1(\Omega) \quad \text{whenever } \alpha \le 1,$$

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{F}_{(B)}) = \{u \in H^1(\Omega) : \gamma_0 u \in H^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\Gamma)\}\,, \quad \text{whenever } \alpha > 1,$$

$$\tilde{F}_B(u, v) = F_N(u, v) + (B\gamma_0 u, \gamma_0 v)_{-\frac{\alpha}{2},\frac{\alpha}{2}}\,.$$

Remark 5.8. Let $\Pi : L^2(\Gamma) \to L^2(\Gamma)$ be an orthogonal projector such that $\mathscr{R}(\Pi) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ is $L^2(\Gamma)$-dense in $\mathscr{R}(\Pi)$. Then for any positive $B \in \mathsf{B}(\mathscr{R}(\Pi))$ one has $(\Pi, B) \in \tilde{\mathsf{E}}(L^2(\Gamma))$. Since $\mathscr{R}(\Pi) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ is a closed subspace of $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$, we have the continuous projection $\Pi_\circ : H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma) \to H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ such that $\mathscr{R}(\Pi_\circ) = \mathscr{R}(\Pi) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ and $\Pi_\circ|\mathscr{R}(\Pi) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma) = \Pi|\mathscr{R}(\Pi) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$. Denoting by $\Pi_\circ^\star : H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma) \to H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ the dual of $\Pi_\circ$ with respect to the duality $(\cdot,\cdot)_{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}$, (5.3) gives $\Pi_\circ^\star \hat{\gamma}_1 u \in \mathscr{R}(\Pi)$ and the boundary conditions

$$\Pi_\circ^\star \hat{\gamma}_1 u = B\gamma_0 u\,.$$

Hence in this case the operator domain of the corresponding self-adjoint extension is given by

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)}) = \{u \in \mathscr{D}(A_{\max}) \cap H^1(\Omega) \,:\, \gamma_0 u \in \mathscr{R}(\Pi)\,,\ \Pi_\circ^\star \hat{\gamma}_1 u = B\gamma_0 u\}\,.$$

In particular, in the case $\Pi = \mathbf{1}$, one obtains, by elliptic regularity,

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{A}_{(B)}) = \{u \in \mathscr{D}(A_{\max}) \cap H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Omega) \,:\, \hat{\gamma}_1 u = B\gamma_0 u\}\,.$$

Example 5.9. Since $H^s(\Gamma)$ is a Dirichlet space for any $s \in [0,1]$, by Remark 5.7 one gets a Markovian extension $\tilde{A}_{(B)}$ by taking

$$B = -b_1\,\Delta_{LB} + b_s(-\Delta_{LB})^s + b_0\,, \quad 0 < s < 1\,,\ b_1, b_s, b_0 \ge 0\,.$$

To such extension corresponds the Wentzell-type boundary conditions

$$b_1\,\Delta_{LB}\,\gamma_0 u - b_s(-\Delta_{LB})^s\gamma_0 u - b_0\gamma_0 u + \gamma_1 u = 0\,.$$

For the corresponding Markovian extension $\tilde{A}_{(B)}$ on has

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{A}_{(B)}) \subseteq H^2(\Omega) \quad \text{whenever } b_1 \ne 0\,,$$

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{A}_{(B)}) \subseteq H^{2s}(\Omega) \quad \text{whenever } b_1 = 0,\ b_s \ne 0 \text{ and } 1/2 \le s < 1\,,$$

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{A}_{(B)}) \subseteq H^{\frac{3}{2}-s}(\Omega) \quad \text{whenever } b_1 = 0,\ b_s \ne 0 \text{ and } 0 < s \le 1/2\,.$$

Since f_B is regular and satisfies the hypothesis given in Lemma 4.18 for any $0 < s < 1$ and $b_1, b_s, b_0 \ge 0$, $\tilde{F}_{(B)}$ is a regular Dirichlet form. Moreover, since the Beurling-Deny decomposition of the Dirichlet form f_B is

$$f_B^{(c)}(h_1,h_2) = b_1(-\Delta_{LB}h_1, h_2)_{-1,1}\,,$$

$$f_B^{(j)}(h_1,h_2) = b_s((-\Delta_{LB})^s h_1, h_2)_{-s,s}\,,$$

$$f_B^{(k)}(h_1,h_2) = b_0\langle h_1, h_2\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}\,,$$

the Beurling-Deny decomposition of the Dirichlet form $\tilde{F}_{(B)}$ is (see Remark 4.7)

$$\tilde{F}_{(B)}^{(c)}(u,v) = F_N(u,v) + b_1(-\Delta_{LB}\gamma_0 u, \gamma_0 v)_{-1,1}\,,$$

$$\tilde{F}_{(B)}^{(j)}(u,v) = b_s((-\Delta_{LB})^s\gamma_0 u, \gamma_0 v)_{-s,s}\,,$$

$$\tilde{F}_{(B)}^{(k)}(u,v) = b_0\langle \gamma_0 u, \gamma_0 v\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}\,.$$

Hence $\tilde{F}_{(B)}$ has the local property (and so $\mathsf{Z}_{\tilde{A}_{(B)}}$ is a Diffusion) if and only if $b_s = 0$ and is strongly local if and only if $b_s = b_0 = 0$. The corresponding Markovian extension $\tilde{A}_{(B)}$ is recurrent if $b_0 = 0$ and transient otherwise.

Example 5.10. Let $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^n$, $n\ge 2$, be open and bounded and such that Γ is a smooth, compact, $n-1$ dimensional Lie group (for example this is true if Ω is a solid torus, or a plane disc with $N\ge 0$ circular holes, or a four-dimensional ball). Let e denote the unit element and let $L_1,\dots,L_{n-1}$ be a basis of left-invariant vector field in the corresponding Lie algebra. Then there exist functions $\zeta_i\in C^2(\Gamma)$, $1\le i<n$, such that $\zeta_i(e)=0$, $L_i\zeta_j(e)=\delta_{ij}$ and $\zeta_i(x^{-1})=-\zeta_i(x)$. A measure ν on the Borel σ-algebra of Γ is said to be a *Lévy measure* whenever $\nu(\{e\})=0$ and $\int_\Gamma((\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}|\zeta_i(x)|^2)\wedge 1)\,d\nu(x)<+\infty$, and is said to be symmetric if $\nu(E)=\nu(E^{-1})$ for any measurable E.

By Hunt's theorem (see [24], [28]; here we use the version provided in [2], Theorem 2.1), any symmetric convolution semigroup of measures in Γ has a generators given by a Markovian self-adjoint operator B on $L^2(\Gamma)$ such that $C^2(\Gamma)\subset\mathscr{D}(B)$ and, for any $h\in C^2(\Gamma)$,

$$Bh(x)=\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1}c_{ij}L_iL_jh(x)+\frac{1}{2}\int_\Gamma\big(h(xy)-2h(x)+h(xy^{-1})\big)\,d\nu(y)\,,$$

where $c\equiv(c_{ij})$ is a constant, real-valued, not-negative-definite matrix and ν is a symmetric Lévy measure.

By Theorem 4.15 and Corollary 5.4, the corresponding Wentzell-type boundary conditions $B\gamma_0u=\hat\gamma_1u$ produce a Markovian extension $\tilde A_{(B)}$ which, since $f_B(1)=0$, is recurrent.

By the Beurling-Deny decomposition of f_B (see [2], Theorem 2.4) and by Remark 4.17, the Beurling-Deny decomposition of the Dirichlet form $\tilde F_{(B)}$ is

$$\tilde F^{(c)}_{(B)}(u,v)=F_N(u,v)+\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1}c_{ij}\int_\Gamma L_i\gamma_0u(x)L_j\gamma_0v(x)\,d\sigma(x)\,,$$

$$\tilde F^{(j)}_{(B)}(u,v)=\int_{\Gamma\times\Gamma}(\gamma_0u(x)-\gamma_0u(y))\,(\gamma_0v(x)-\gamma_0v(y))\,dJ(x,y)\,,$$

$$\tilde F^{(k)}_{(B)}(u,v)=0\,,$$

where the measure J is defined by

$$J(E_1\times E_2):=\int_{E_2}\nu(y^{-1}E_1)\,d\sigma(y)\,.$$

Example 5.11. Given the decomposition $\Gamma=\Gamma_0\cup\Gamma_1$, Γ_0 open, let $\Pi:L^2(\Gamma)\to L^2(\Gamma)$ be the orthogonal projector $\Pi\,h:=1_{\Gamma_0}h$ and let $B=0$. Then

$$\mathscr{R}(\Pi)=\{h\in L^2(\Gamma):\operatorname{supp}(h)\subseteq\bar\Gamma_0\}\simeq L^2(\Gamma_0)\,.$$

Since $C_c^\infty(\Gamma_0)$ is dense in $L^2(\Gamma_0)$ and

$$C_c^\infty(\Gamma_0) \simeq \{h \in C^\infty(\Gamma) : \operatorname{supp}(h) \subset \Gamma_0\} \subseteq \mathscr{R}(\Pi) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)\,,$$

$\mathscr{R}(\Pi) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ is dense in $\mathscr{R}(\Pi)$. Then, by Remark 5.8, one gets the self-adjoint extension A_{DN} with domain

$$\mathscr{D}(A_{DN}) = \{u \in \mathscr{D}(A_{\max}) \cap H^1(\Omega) : \operatorname{supp}(\gamma_0 u) \subseteq \bar{\Gamma}_0,\ \operatorname{supp}(\hat{\gamma}_1 u) \subseteq \Gamma_1\}\,.$$

The conditions appearing in $\mathscr{D}(A_{DN})$ are a weak form of the mixed Dirichlet-Neumann boundary conditions

$$\gamma_0 u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_1\,, \quad \gamma_1 u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_0\,.$$

Since $(1_{\Gamma_0} h)_\# = 1_{\Gamma_0} h_\#$, by Theorem 4.15 and Corollary 5.4 such boundary conditions are of Wentzell-type and define a (transient) Markovian extension with associated Dirichlet form F_{DN} given by

$$\mathscr{D}(F_{DN}) = \{u \in H^1(\Omega) \,:\, \operatorname{supp}(\gamma_0 u) \subseteq \bar{\Gamma}_0\}\,, \quad F_{DN}(u,v) = F_N(u,v)\,.$$

Even if F_{DN} is not regular on $\bar{\Omega}$, it has an associated Markov process: it is the part process of the reflecting diffusion associated to F_N killed upon hitting Γ_1 (see Example 6.6.12 (ii) in [8]).

Example 5.12. Let $\mathscr{R}(\Pi) \subset L^2(\Gamma)$ be the one-dimensional subspace corresponding to the orthogonal projector $\Pi = (|\Gamma|^{-\frac{1}{2}} 1) \otimes (|\Gamma|^{-\frac{1}{2}} 1)$, where $|\Gamma|$ denotes the volume of the boundary Γ, and let $B = b\,|\Gamma|^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{1} : \mathscr{R}(\Pi) \to \mathscr{R}(\Pi)$, $b \ge 0$. Then, by Remark 5.8, denoting by $\langle h \rangle$ the mean of $h \in H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma)$ over Γ, i.e. $\langle h \rangle := (h,1)_{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{D}(\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)}) =& \{u \in \mathscr{D}(A_{\max}) \cap H^1(\Omega) : b\,\gamma_0 u = \langle \hat{\gamma}_1 u \rangle\} \\ =& \{u \in H^2(\Omega) : b\,\gamma_0 u = \langle \gamma_1 u \rangle\}\,.\end{aligned}$$

The corresponding bilinear form is

$$\mathscr{D}(\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}) = \{u \in H^1(\Omega) : \gamma_0 u = \text{const.}\}\,.$$

$$\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}(u,v) = F_N(u,v) + b\,|\Gamma|^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle \gamma_0 u \rangle \langle \gamma_0 v \rangle\,.$$

Since $f_{\Pi,B}$ is obviously a Dirichlet form, $\tilde{F}_{(\Pi,B)}$ is a (not regular) Dirichlet form and so $\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)}$ is a Markovian extension and the boundary conditions $b\,\gamma_0 u = \langle \gamma_1 u \rangle$ are of Wentzell-type. $\tilde{A}_{(\Pi,B)}$ is recurrent whenever $b = 0$, otherwise it is transient.

References

[1] A. Ancona: Continuité des contractions dans les espaces de Dirichlet, *Seminaire de Theorie du Potentiel Paris No.2*, Lecture Notes in Math. 563, Berlin; Springer-Verlag, 1976.

[2] D. Applebaum: Some L^2 Properties of Semigroups of Measures on Lie Groups. *Semigroup Forum.* **79** (2009), 217-228.

[3] A. Beurling, J. Deny: Dirichlet Spaces. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **45** (1959), 208-215.

[4] M.S. Birman: On the Self-Adjoint Extensions of Positive Definite Operators. *Mat. Sbornik* **38** (1956), 431–450 (in russian)

[5] J.M. Bony, P. Courrège, P. Priouret: Semi-groupes de Feller sur une variètè à bord compacte et problèmes aux limites intégro-diffèrentiels du second ordre donnant lieu au principe du maximum. *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **18** (1968), 369-521.

[6] B.M. Brown, M. Marletta, S. Naboko, I.G. Wood: Boundary triplets and M-functions for non-selfadjoint operators, with applications to elliptic PDEs and block operator matrices. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **77** (2008), 700-718.

[7] B.M. Brown, G. Grubb, I.G. Wood: M-functions for closed extensions of adjoint pairs of operators with applications to elliptic boundary problems. *Math. Nachr.* **282** (2009), 314-347.

[8] Z. Chen, M. Fukushima: *Symmetric Markov processes, time change, and boundary theory.* Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2012.

[9] E.B. Davies: *Heat kernels and Spectral Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

[10] E.B. Davies *Linear Operators and their Spectra.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[11] V.A. Derkach, M.M. Malamud: Generalized Resolvents and the Boundary Value Problem for Hermitian Operators with Gaps. *J. Funct. Anal.* **95** (1991), 1-95.

[12] W. Feller: Generalized second order differential operators and their lateral conditions, *Illinois J. Math.* **1** (1957), 459-504.

[13] M. Fukushima: On Feller's kernel and the Dirichlet norm. *Nagoya Math. J.*, **24** (1964), 167-175

[14] M. Fukushima: On boundary conditions for multi-dimensional Brownian motions with symmetric resolvent densities. *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **21** (1969), 58-93.

[15] M. Fukushima: Dirichlet spaces and strong Markov processes. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **162** (1971), 185-224.

[16] M. Fukushima: *Dirichlet forms and Markov processes*, Amsterdam: North-Holland 1980.

[17] M. Fukushima, Y. Oshima, M. Takeda: *Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes, 2nd edition.* Berlin: De Gruyter 2011.

[18] F. Gesztesy, M. Mitrea: A description of all self-adjoint extensions of the Laplacian and Kreĭn-type resolvent formulas on non-smooth domains. *J. Anal. Math.* **113** (2011), 53-172.

[19] F. Gesztesy, M. Mitrea, R. Nichols: Heat kernel bound for elliptic partial differential operators in divergence forms with Robin-type boundary conditions. To appear in *J. Anal. Math.*, 2012

[20] L. Gross: Logarithmic Sobolev Inequalities and Contractive Properties of Semigroups. In *Dirichlet Forms.* Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1563. Berlin: Springer-Verlag 1993.

[21] G. Grubb: A Characterization of the Non-Local Boundary Value Problems Associated with Elliptic Operators. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **22** (1968), 425-513

[22] G. Grubb: Les problèmes aux limites génèraux d'un opèrateur elliptique, provenant de la théorie variationnelle. *Bull. Sc. Math.* **94** (1970),113-157.

[23] G. Grubb: Krein Resolvent Formulas for Elliptic Boundary problems in Nonsmooth Domains. *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Pol. Torino* **66** (2008), 271-297.

[24] G.A. Hunt: Semigroups of measures on Lie groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **81** (1956), 264-93.

[25] M.G. Kreĭn: The theory of self-adjoint extensions of semi-bounded Hermitian transformations and their applications. *Mat. Sbornik* **20** (1947), 431-495 (in russian).

[26] H. Kunita: General boundary conditions for multi-dimensional diffusion processes. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **10** (1970), 273-335.

[27] Y. LeJan: Mesures associées à une forme de Dirichlet. Applications. *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **106** (1978), 61-112.

[28] M. Liao: *Lévy Processes in Lie Groups.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press 2004

[29] J.L. Lions, E. Magenes: *Non-Homogeneous Boundary Value Problems and Applications, vol. I.* Berlin: Springer-Verlag 1972.

[30] M.M. Malamud: Some classes of extensions of a Hermitian operator with lacunae. *Ukrainian Math. J.* **44** (1992), 190-204.

[31] M.M. Malamud: Spectral theory of elliptic operators in exterior domains. *Russ. J. Math. Phys.* **17** (2010), 96-125.

[32] W. McLean: *Strongly Elliptic Systems and Boundary Integral Equations.* Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000.

[33] J. von Neumann: Allgemeine Eigenwerttheorie Hermitscher Funktionaloperatoren. *Math. Ann.* **102** (1929-30), 49-131.

[34] A. Posilicano: A Kreĭn-like Formula for Singular Perturbations of Self-Adjoint Operators and Applications. *J. Funct. Anal.* **183** (2001), 109-147.

[35] A. Posilicano: Self-Adjoint Extensions by Additive Perturbations. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.*(5) **2** (2003), 1-20.

[36] A. Posilicano: Boundary Triples and Weyl Functions for Singular Perturbations of Self-Adjoint Operators. *Methods. Funct. Anal. Topology* **10** (2004), 57-63.

[37] A. Posilicano: Self-Adjoint Extensions of Restrictions. *Operators and Matrices* **2** (2008), 483-506.

[38] A. Posilicano, L. Raimondi: Krein's Resolvent Formula for Self-Adjoint Extensions of Symmetric Second Order Elliptic Differential Operators. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **42** (2009), 015204.

[39] D. W. Robinson, A. Sikora: Markov uniqueness of degenerate elliptic operators. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.*(5) **10** (2011), 683-710.

[40] V. Ryzhov: A general boundary value problem and its Weyl function. *Opuscula Math.* **27** (2007), 305-331.

[41] M.L. Silverstein: *Symmetric Markov processes.* Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 426. Berlin: Springer-Verlag 1974

[42] M.L. Silverstein: *Boundary theory for symmetric Markov processes.* Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 516. Berlin: Springer-Verlag 1976

[43] K. Taira: *Semigroups, boundary value problems and Markov processes.* Berlin: Springer-Verlag 2004.

[44] T. Ueno: The diffusion satisfying Wentzell's boundary condition and the Markov process on the boundary. I. *Proc. Japan Acad.* **36** (1960), 533-538.

[45] T. Ueno: The diffusion satisfying Wentzell's boundary condition and the Markov process on the boundary. II. *Proc. Japan Acad.* **36** (1960), 625-629.

[46] M.L. Višik: On General Boundary Problems for Elliptic Differential Equations. *Trudy Mosc. Mat. Obsv.* **1** (1952) 186-246; *Amer. Math. Soc. Trans.* (2) **24** (1963), 107-172.

[47] F.-Y. Wang: *Functional Inequalities, Markov Semigroups and Spectral Properties.* Beijing/New-York: Science Press 2005.

[48] A.D. Wentzell: On boundary conditions for multi-dimensional diffusion processes. *Theor. Probability Appl.* **4** (1959), 164-177.

DIPSAT - SEZIONE DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DELL'INSUBRIA, I-22100 COMO, ITALY

E-mail address: `posilicano@uninsubria.it`